THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1924. Vol. XIV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Menace of an Absolutist Episcopacy.

Bishop William Temple wrote on one occasion: 'The Bishops are either the organs of the Holy Ghost or they are nothing.' This statement is profoundly true, but it may be so held as to be practically false. To be practically true, it must be held in conjunction with another great affirmation: 'Every Christian is an organ of the Holy Ghost, or he is nothing.' Bishop Temple is not responsible for this aphorism: it is the New Testament which is responsible for it. There seems to be a tendency at the present time to forget this on the part of some of our bishops, not we think in England, but in the Episcopal Church of America and in other provinces of the Anglican communion, if we may judge from various public protests.[1] These bishops seem to be forgetting that they are co-sharers of the Holy Spirit with all their fellow-Christians. It is the Christian Church as a whole, and not a particular section of it which is Spirit-bearing (*pneumatophoros*). If invidious distinctions are made and it be claimed that one section of the Church has the Spirit in larger measure than others, then it is the prophetic souls which can best substantiate that claim. However, in the light of Church History all such claims are fallacious and injurious. Laymen and laywomen have been as conspicuous Spirit-bearers as ecclesiastics—an Elizabeth Fry, a John Bunyan, a William Wilberforce, an Earl of Shaftesbury in our English Christianity have been as truly organs of

[1] *E.g.* A writer in *The Chronicle* (New York) for May, 1924, describing the serious decline in the Episcopal Church in 'the Middle West' of the United States, writes: 'The main causes are the tyranny of the bishops and the intrusion of Pagan-Catholic ideas of doctrine and worship. That the bishop's will is the law of the Church is the growth of the last fifty years' (p. 202).

the Holy Ghost as the worthiest of our bishops, and certainly much more so than many of our less worthy bishops. Tradition sanctions the belief that the gift of the Holy Spirit is imparted by the laying on of episcopal hands, but if this be so it is not limited to the laying on of episcopal hands. 'The Spirit bloweth where it listeth,' and the members of the household of Cornelius received the Spirit before St. Peter laid hands on them. The laying on of episcopal hands symbolizes the conferring of ecclesiastical authority in Ordination, and the imparting of the Divine Grace and Blessing in Confirmation, but it does not imply that the Bishop is the unique organ of the Holy Ghost in the Christian Church. When bishops regard themselves as unique organs of the Holy Ghost, it proves as detrimental to them personally as it is to the welfare of the Church, for the reasonable spirit of a constitutional episcopacy is then replaced by that of a superstitious and tyrannical prelacy.

A bishop is best reminded of his true position in relation to the great body of his clergy by remembering the description of it which is at least as old as St. Jerome, that he is 'the first among equals' (*primus inter pares*). He is president and leader, and that in a strictly representative and constitutional sense. He can as a bishop do nothing rightly in isolation from, still less in opposition to, his clergy and laity. In personal matters he possesses that freedom which belongs to every Christian layman; and in the sphere of utterance he may emulate the boldness (παρρησία) of the Christian prophet, although strangely enough Church History indicates that while the rarest and most beautiful sanctity has been attained by laymen and laywomen like St. Francis and St. Theresa, the bravest and most moving of our Christian prophets like John Wycliffe, John Huss, Martin Luther, John Wesley and F. D. Maurice have sprung not from the ranks of the episcopate, but from that of the priesthood.

Theological Progress in Canada.

It is not unusual to think of Canada as being some twenty years behind this country in theological and Biblical knowledge. We are not by any means sure that this is a just estimate, but if it be so, such a situation is easily accounted for. Modern

theological and Biblical knowledge of the critical kind does not seem a possession to be coveted by a zealous pastor of souls. In the earlier stages of its acquirement, it is a hindrance rather than a help. Its possession is not only a source of anxious questionings, which are not easily answered, but it also separates the shepherd from the sheep. He reads his Bible differently from what they do: passages which say one thing to them say something very different to him. He is apt to wish that he were back again in the old pre-scientific stage as the possessor and expounder of an infallible book.

It is then natural enough that the Churches in young countries like Canada and Australia should set no great store by modern Biblical and theological studies as an important factor in the training of their clergy. Yet troublesome as such studies are, they are in the long run indispensable. Religious teaching has to come to terms with science, and history, and philosophy; and the general culture of the clergy ought to be well above the average culture of their community. To have a really effective clergy they ought, besides their moral and spiritual qualifications, to be equal educationally to the best men in other departments of learning. Yet where practical pastoral needs are pressing and financial resources are small, it is no easy matter to secure this.

Besides up-to-date Biblical teaching in the universities and colleges, one of the greatest incentives to theological progress is an ably-edited magazine. It is for this reason that we hail the advent of the first number of the *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*.[1] It is interdenominational; Presbyterians, Methodists, and Anglicans are among its contributors. The editorial sets out its ideal quite clearly in the following statement:

> 'Religion has suffered much in the past, and is suffering very greatly to-day, from the fact that men have been afraid to say what they really thought about many things that were more or less vitally related to it. In the sphere of religion there has ever been special resentment against things that were new or upsetting . . . For this reason there has been considerable repression and withholding, even on the part of men who desired to be true to their convictions. But after all nothing is quite so good or essential as honesty, and to be untrue to its demands for any reason is to run a serious risk. In the end nothing has been gained and much has been lost by a too great

[1] A bi-monthly published by the Ryerson Press, Toronto, single copies 50 cents, annual subscription $2.40.

> counselling with fear in the expression of any conviction sincerely and vitally held. The founders of this magazine desire that in its pages honest men may honestly say the things they believe without any mumbling or fear. They cherish no cheap ambition to create a journal that shall be called radical or extreme, but they do hope to help in the establishing of one that shall place a premium upon frank, straightforward, unequivocal presentation and discussion. They believe that the greatest of all heterodoxies is the heterodoxy of the heart that is not valiant for the truth that it accepts and claims to live by.'

The most important article is by Prof. A. S. Peake on 'The Alleged Reaction in Old Testament Criticism.' Dr. Peake, it is interesting to note, sees no reaction from the main positions reached by Old Testament criticism, *viz.* the analysis of the Pentateuch into four main documents, the basing of Josiah's Reformation on the Deuteronomic Code, the placing of the Priestly Code after Ezekiel, the highly composite character of Isaiah, and the Maccabaean date of Daniel. On minor points there is a tendency towards reaction, *e.g.* Kittel and Gressmann argue for the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue.

The next most important article is by Principal James Smyth on 'The Faith of a Modern Man.' It contains a striking epigram by Prof. E. C. Moore:

> 'This is a world in which nature is supernatural to the core and the supernatural is natural to the limit.'

The central thought of the writer of the article is set forth in the following sentences:

> 'No external authority, no physical phenomenon, no alleged interference with the law of nature, no emotional experience raised in the multitude, no faith-healing or miraculous cure demonstration, can lay on a rational human being any moral or spiritual obligation to accept doctrines which do not commend themselves to the highest and best in his own mind and heart.'
>
> '"The Kingdom of God" is that which appeals to the modern mind as the best expression of the equivalent of religion.'

We wish this new magazine a wide circulation and a growing influence.

Prayer Book Revision and Modern Churchmen.

On the same day (20th June) two lucid and reasonable articles were published on Prayer Book Revision, the one contributed by the Dean of York to the *Guardian*, the other by Canon E. W. Barnes to the *Church of England Newspaper*.

The Dean asserts that there are two sets of people who want no revision. There are those who are satisfied with the

Prayer Book as it is; there are those who have already revised it for themselves. But there is a third class, and a growing one, those who recognize that the only revision which at the present time the English Church is likely to get is of a distinctly reactionary and mediaevalist character. This third class, although they earnestly desire revision, would rather see the clock remain stationary than see it put back, and so although they cannot sign Bishop Knox's petition, yet find themselves more ready to sympathise with it than with the revision movement against which it is directed. Canon Barnes appears to take this view, as do an increasing number of Liberal or Modernist Churchmen, especially since the collapse of Liberal Evangelicalism in the Jerusalem Chamber Conferences. As Canon Barnes writes:

'Undoubtedly Prayer Book Revision is long overdue. We are suffering from the fact that a beginning of such revision was not made two generations ago. The ordinary Church services are unattractive to large numbers of men and women who count themselves members of the Church. They are "too long," "dull," "incomprehensible because of their archaic language," "unrelated to modern conditions and modern thought." We need greater simplicity, greater elasticity, extensive re-statement. I am convinced that we need not, and should not, alter in any of its fundamentals the distinctive doctrinal position of the Church of England as laid down in the Articles. But, where modern knowledge has made detailed changes of language necessary, we ought to make such changes. To have to interpret any statement in a non-natural sense, to assign to it a meaning other than it was intended to have, does harm. And, alike in the regular and in the occasional services, there are statements of this character.

'We ought then to have a revised Prayer Book suited, by reason of its simple services and clear teaching, to the bulk of our people. Yet can we provide the massed wisdom necessary for the right kind of constructive reform? For thirty years our ordinands, taken as a whole, have been defective in quality and insufficient in number. Plainly the time is not propitious for Prayer Book Revision; and yet some revision cannot be delayed. The wisest course at the present juncture would be substantially that suggested by the official Committee: to have a first instalment of change, removing archaisms, introducing prayers suited to modern needs and avoiding the greater controversial issues. This policy has been effectively rejected by the House of Clergy. The sacramental controversy has been forced to the front, and the ideal of liturgical uniformity has been abandoned. In itself uniformity is of small consequence; but, when departure from it implies differences of doctrine, the path to disruption is opened.

'The sacramental theories on which the practice of reservation is based cannot be reconciled with the plain meaning and intention of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Liturgical changes which bring the Communion Service nearer to the Mass imply a departure from the doctrinal standards of the Reformation. Such types of change are

essentially reactionary, because they afford a shelter to the pagan sacramentalism and sacerdotal magic which are non-Christian elements in Catholicism. Our modern need is a liturgy based on the New Testament, and especially on Christ's own teaching. We want a development, and not a repudiation, of the revision made at the Reformation, when the new knowledge of the Renaissance gave a new freedom and power to human thought.

'For some three hundred years the Reformation revision of the Prayer Book sufficed. During the last century, however, the growth of human knowledge has practically made a new Renaissance. But this second Renaissance is the logical consequence of the first. And, therefore, the new revision of the Prayer Book must, if our Church is to remain truly representative of English Christianity, embody the logical development of the position reached in Queen Elizabeth's reign.'

What is then to be the policy of Modern Churchmen? Are they to oppose revision at present, and side with Bishop Knox? This seems a counsel of despair. Are they then to ask that the Communion Office remain unrevised and that revision be proceeded with in other and less controversial directions? This would be a better policy. But a more courageous policy and one more in harmony with their principles would be for them in company with the Grey Book revisers and representative Liberal Evangelicals to approach the Church authorities and to affirm that they will agree to concessions of a Catholic character in the Communion Office being made to the more moderate Anglo-Catholic party on three conditions. First, that the present Prayer Book as it stands shall remain one of the 'permissible alternatives.' Secondly, that the authority shall lie entirely in the hands of the parishioners to refuse assent to any innovations or departure from the present authorized use. Thirdly, that the third permissible alternative Communion Use shall be definitely Modernist or Liberal Evangelical.

We believe that in adopting this policy Modern Churchmen would be true to their ideals of comprehensiveness and progress rather than in adopting the *non possumus* attitude of Bishop Knox. We believe also that the great majority of reasonable Anglo-Catholics like the Dean of York would be willing to support this policy.

May we urge the authorities of the Churchmen's Union, the Grey Book authorities, and the representatives of Liberal Evangelicalism to take *immediate* steps for adopting a united policy and making representations in that quarter where they are secure of a sympathetic and effective hearing? We may

take it for granted that those who have the welfare of our Zion at heart desire neither to be dragged at the chariot wheels of Bishop Knox or of Dr. Darwell Stone, though undoubtedly they would gladly please and profit them both by a policy of Prayer Book revision which, while it made concessions to both of these party leaders, yet also promised such a revision as the growing knowledge and widening outlook of English Christendom demands.

Reservation of the Sacrament.

The *Times* of July 2 informs us that:

> 'The principle of the reservation of the Sacrament was accepted *in toto* by the House of Clergy of the National Assembly of the Church of England yesterday, by a majority of 176 to 91. The form in which this alteration of the Prayer Book was sanctioned was that proposed by Dr. Darwell Stone, who, in reply to a question, categorically affirmed that the object of his amendment (to the Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923) was to provide not "for reservation for the sick only, or for exceptional cases, but also for forms of adoration, for the holding of special services in the way of adoration, and to encourage people to say their prayers before the reserved Sacrament." "Adoration," he said, "was the right word, and the attitude of the soul that it described was the right attitude."'

From the first the question of Reservation has been treated by its supporters with characteristic disingenuousness. If the demand had been made in the interests of the sick, no reasonable Churchman would have refused it. But only those who desire to be deceived could think that this was so: it is notorious that it was made for reasons of another order. This is now admitted; the mover of the amendment carried confessing that the object was 'to provide, not for reservation for the sick only, but for the holding of special services of adoration.' Another speaker adds that 'they could not prevent people saying their prayers before the reserved Sacrament in church'; and that, 'if the House put a prohibition on reservation altogether, it would be absolutely futile, for a considerable number of clergy were convinced that they had a right to reserve the Sacrament, and would go on practising reservation in spite of any decision the House arrived at.' On the following day an attempt was made to evade the real issue by a provision that the reservation proposed should be 'in accordance with such rules as shall be framed from time to time by the Archbishop and Bishops of

the Province, or with Canons lawfully passed by the Convocation of the Province.'

There are signs that the more reasonable Anglo-Catholics are growing dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Assembly. A correspondent of the *Church Times* is of opinion that 'were Revision postponed for twenty years, a universal sigh of relief would go up' from the Church; another writes that it is time that what he describes as 'the dragging farce' of Revision should be brought to an end. It is well that the matter has been brought to a head on a definite issue. It must be evident to the least intelligent, and it cannot be denied by the least candid, observer that what is desired by the House of Clergy is not the adaptation of the Prayer Book to modern needs, but a reversion to mediaeval, and an approximation to modern Roman, beliefs and formulas; that the recalcitrant clergy are not open to compromise; and that it is useless to attempt to frame a law—Omnipotence itself could not do so—which they will obey. Intolerable as the existing anarchy is, it is clear that Revision offers no escape from it. There are, no doubt, changes which most of us would be glad to see made in the Prayer Book. But these changes are not those contemplated by the revisers. And if, with the present *fiasco* before us, we persevere in entrusting the delicate work of revision to the partisan policies of the National Assembly, our last state will be worse than our first.

In the *Gloucester Diocesan Magazine* for July, Dr. Headlam, in response to the desire of the Diocesan Conference, states that he is prepared to sanction Reservation subject to the following conditions:

> 'With regard to Reservation, I feel that I am in a strong position in granting permission, as a large majority, both of the Clergy and of the Laity, voted in favour of permission for purposes of Communion. On the other side I must point out that the majority against Reservation for any other purposes was still larger, and I am sure that the confidence which has been placed in me by the Diocesan Conference is conditional on the whole will of the Conference being respected. I am, therefore, bound to take care that wherever Reservation is permitted it is not for any other purpose than that of Communion, and that the Reservation takes place in such a way as guards against any misuse.'

This decision, we believe, has the great weight of sober and loyal Church feeling behind it. The resolution passed by the House of Clergy serves only to show the unrepresentative character of that body.

THE HUMAN APPROACH TO THE INCARNATION

By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of *Studies in Modernism.*

IN a remarkable passage in his *Arians of the Fourth Century*, Cardinal Newman contrasts the ante-Nicene with the post-Nicene age.

> 'If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is absolutely the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the Primitive Church, it is not from any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult as in a virtue; but, first, because technicality and formalism are, in their degree, inevitable results of public confessions of faith; and, next, because, when confessions do not exist, the mysteries of divine truth, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane multitude, are left hidden in the bosom of the Church.'[1]

The growth of these confessions of faith was gradual; the credal tendency is older than the creeds. But it was not till Christianity became the Empire-Church that it was unchecked. Political motives reinforced theological; to follow the History of Dogma it is essential to keep the secular politics of the period in view. It was a hybrid process; and its results were disastrous. 'It was a melancholy age,' says a Catholic historian: 'an age of decrepitude and ruin.' The outcome of these disputes was the separation of Eastern from Western Christendom; the dismemberment of the Christian Empire; the overthrow of Christian civilization by Turkish barbarism in Syria, Egypt, and the East. '*Tel fut le prix de ces exercises metaphysiques!*'[2]

(2) Human thought still spins its problems out of its own substance. It may seem one of the ironies of history that the religious consciousness of to-day should be haunted by the very same questionings which perplexed that of the fifth century. Yet it is less strange than it may appear: their occurrence, their disappearance for a time, and their recurrence are according to plan. It was impossible that such questions as: How

[1] Newman's *Arians*, p. 36.
[2] Duchesne: *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, vol. iii, p. 324.

can the notion of plurality in God be reconciled with that of unity? and: How can Christ be at once God and man? should not present themselves as soon as an attempt was made to think these beliefs out; it was impossible that the answers first given should be adequate; it was impossible that, when their inadequacy was recognized, the ill-laid ghosts should not return. Perhaps no solution at which we can arrive can be more than provisional. But we may remember that two widely differing schools of theology, those of Alexandria and of Antioch, divided the Church of the Fathers. The former prevailed; and to this day the theology of the Churches, Protestant and Catholic alike, bears its stamp. But there was an earlier theology than either—the Ante-Nicene: and, great as is the name of Athanasius, this theology found another interpretation than his in the Antiochene school.

(3) We are accustomed to think of the Incarnation as a fact or belief transcending human reason, and standing outside the natural order. If, by the Incarnation, we mean the fully-developed doctrine of the Œcumenical Councils, this no doubt is so. But there is another method of approach in which history, not dogma, is the point of departure. Here that element of human opinion and will which (Marcellus of Ancyra tells us) is inseparable from the notion of dogma is avoided; we begin with what we know. We sift the evidence of the New Testament; accept its accentuation of Christ's manhood; and only then ask ourselves whether and in what sense he is God. Thus envisaged, the Incarnation comes to us not like a light flashed on the darkness of this mysterious universe in which we find ourselves, and by very contrast making its darkness darker yet, but like a gentle ray proportioned to our imperfect vision. It shows us God as near and friendly, and exhibits the world not as the theatre of the incalculable and disconnected, but as a rational order, fitted to be the home of the rational creature, man. The unity of process which thought discerns in things is, it assures us, unbroken: look where we will, we do not find in them any arbitrary and irrational gap. No; the whole is determined by sequence, coherence, correlation—in a word, by law. This is why the traditional notion of miracle, in the sense of a breach of continuity, is literally 'insignificant,' *i.e.* a meaningless phrase doing duty for thought; and, because it is

itself unthinkable, explaining nothing.[3] In having recourse to it we do but impose upon ourselves, and upon those—they are, no doubt, many—whose intellectual hunger is capable of being appeased by words. 'The missionary who seeks to serve the Lord Jesus,' says a devout worker in the mission field, 'must sometimes wonder whether he would not please Christ better by speaking less about Him.' We should do well to take those wise words to heart. For it is a subject on which we may speak much, yet say little. There would be fewer religious disputes were the proceedings of the rival sectaries opened by the reading of what is, perhaps, the greatest of English sermons—that of Bishop Butler on the Ignorance of Man.

(4) Among the secret things which are too difficult to be understood in this life Melancthon numbered the question: *How* the Two Natures, the Divine and the Human, are united in Christ; as also did Hooker:

> 'It is not in man's ability either to express perfectly or conceive the manner in which this was brought about.'[4]

It is not one with regard to which it can be said either that Scripture is conclusive or tradition uniform. The former contains more than one Christology; and, with regard to the latter, Alexandria is balanced by Antioch, and both claim to be the heirs of the Ante-Nicene age. Among ourselves the recoil from the naturalism of the last generation has caused orthodoxy to emphasize rather the divine than the human in Christ. Many of us are unconscious Tritheists, saying in our hearts, if not with our lips, 'there be three Gods, or three Lords.' There is an unwillingness to recognize the truth of our Lord's humanity: popular theology borders on Docetism, and repudiates rather the name than the thing. Such incidents as the constant prayer of Christ, His Temptation, Passion, Dereliction on the Cross, are treated as difficulties—and superficially and unconvincingly; the instinctively human touches in the Gospels are overlooked or explained away.

> 'His parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover.'
>
> 'His father and his mother were wondering at the things which were spoken concerning him.'
>
> 'Thy father and I sought thee sorrowing.'

[3] *University Addresses.* John Caird, D.D., p. 8.
[4] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 52.

'He could do no mighty works there.'

'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, neither the Son, but the Father only.'

'My Father is greater than I.'

'I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God':

'that they should know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'[5]

Had the New Testament been subjected to a theological censor, can we doubt that such passages as these—and others might be quoted in the same sense—would have been expunged, or 'edited' out of all recognition? Happily, at an early date the text came to be regarded as too sacred to be tempered with, and was too well known, to be 'edited' without detection. Its various *strata*, therefore, lie side by side unreconciled; and show clearly that those who brought them together, and left them as they have come down to us, saw Christ from another angle and in another perspective than ours. There are three distinct Christologies in the New Testament: that of the Synoptics and the first chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, which seems to suggest a still earlier one behind it; the Pauline; and the Johannine. The three differ radically from one another; and it is impossible to identify or reconcile that of the Great Councils, which prevails in the modern Churches, with any one of the three.

(5) 'No man hath seen God at any time.' When, therefore, we think of Christ, it is well not to begin with the Divine Nature, of which we can know little, but with the human, of which we know much. 'What manner of man is this?' we may ask; and when we do so, new horizons open before us. The habit of conceiving Him *sub specie Deitatis—i.e.* as God—and of bringing in the notion of Deity, abruptly and arbitrarily, to solve the difficulties, often of our own making, in the Gospel narrative, and to silence the questions which present themselves to thought, has had two disastrous consequences: (i) it has left the impression that these difficulties and questions are insoluble, whereas all that we are entitled to conclude is that this particular method of meeting them has not solved them, as indeed it has not; and (ii) it has taken from 'the man Christ

[5] *Luke* ii, 33, 41, 43, 48; *Mark* vi, 8; *Matt.* xxiv, 36; *John* xiv, 28; xx, 17; xvii, 3.

Jesus' His real humanity, leaving Him shapeless, colourless, featureless—the phantom, or mere semblance of a man. Hence the picture of Christianity as a religion of pure passiveness. History does not confirm this picture. Christianity is an intensely human phenomenon: this is why those who have attacked it in any of its various forms, from Catholicism to Calvinism, have found themselves up against a very big and intractable thing.

(6) And such as it is, so also was the Founder. He was a very human, a very many-sided and complete man. Misleading as such epithets often are, the word revolutionary expresses a real side of His teaching: how much not only of our religion but of our civilization, political, social and industrial, it cuts away! It undermined the whole foundation of the Jewish Temple State, and the particularism of Jewish religion. No wonder that the priests and the rabbis hated it: were it to find acceptance, their occupation would be gone. Jesus was a Galilean, not a Jew; a countryman, not a townsman; a 'carpenter's son,' not a rabbi; a frequenter, not of the schools, but of the hills and the lake-side. He was born and bred a peasant; He lived in the open, in the sun and under the free heaven, in cloud and wind and rain. The parables reveal Him as open to life on all sides and under all aspects; no one ever had a keener nature-sense; no teaching was ever so instinctive, so untrammelled, so full of light and air. He thought, as he lived, freely; interpreting, rejecting, breaking away from the text, from tradition and convention, from the letter of the law. His attitude towards the Old Testament, the civil and religious code of his nation, was that of a critic, and a critic standing on a higher level than that of his text. 'Ye have heard that it was said of old time. But—I say unto you.' He took nothing and no one for granted: he invariably asked, Why? Now people may be divided into two classes: those who do, and those who do not, ask, Why? To put the question is to have taken up a very definite position with regard to institutions, beliefs, and ideas. This position is offensive to the mentally inactive. They think it wanting in humility. How many ignoble vices usurp the style of this virtue! Father Tyrrell used to say, 'I hope I am not humble'; and, when his hearers looked astonished, he would add, 'from what I have seen of humble men.'

The qualities which he had in view are welcome, and their absence is displeasing, to hierarchies. It is probable that Annas and Caiaphas thought Jesus greatly wanting in humility: 'This man (they said) blasphemeth.' It was war to the knife between His and their outlook over religion; a man must choose, then as now, between the two. And the reformer took his life in his hands. The man who could face a persecuting Church, an unscrupulous priesthood, and a fanatical mob, in a cause where the dice were loaded, and death was the penalty of failure, had the virtues of a very strong man. We recall Luther, who would go to Worms, 'though there were as many devils there as there were tiles on the house-tops'; or Knox, 'who never feared the face of man.'

(7) The impression made on those who were brought into contact with Christ was overwhelming.

> 'They were astonished at his doctrine.'
>
> 'He called unto him those whom he himself would, and they came unto him.'
>
> 'His word was with authority.'
>
> 'Those who heard him were full of amazement, saying, "We have heard strange things to-day."'
>
> 'Never man spake as this man.'
>
> 'Thou hast the words of eternal life.'[6]

His consciousness of God, a consciousness which with us is dim and interrupted, was vivid and unbroken; he lived in the eternal, and under serene skies. He was no stranger to tears, to indignation, to suffering. But there was a luminous background. The reflective retrospect of the first and greatest of Christian mystics gives the key to this unique experience: 'the Son can do nothing of himself; but what he seeth the Father doing; for what things soever he doeth, these the Son doeth in like manner.'[7] The perspective, the level, are unmistakeable. No one would now reject the cure-miracles; 'the power of the Lord was with Him to heal'[8]: and it would probably be unsafe to rule out even the nature-wonders *à priori*. Our knowledge of nature is relative and limited; raised to a certain point, and given certain conditions, is it inconceivable that human powers

[6] *St. Luke* ii, 47; *Matt.* vii, 29; xix, 25; *Mark* i, 20; iii, 13; *John* vi, 68; vii, 46.

[7] *John* v, 19.

[8] *Luke* v, 17.

should transcend the normal? Whether, in this case, they would still be called human, is a question of words. The Achilles' heel of the ψίλος ἄνθρωπος, or mere-man, theory of Christ lies in the adjective. A philosopher who was asked whether he held it answered, 'I will tell you, if you will tell me what a "mere" man is.'

(8) Did He claim to be God? it is asked. Passages from the Gospels may be alleged in one sense and in the other. The question cannot be decided by 'proof-texts': such words as 'I and the Father are one' are balanced by others in which the distinction between the two is strongly asserted, 'My Father is greater than I.' He was not the Father; nor was He co-extensive with Deity: if 'the Son is God,' the Father also is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And St. Paul's phrase, that 'being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery'—*i.e.* a spoil to be grasped at or boasted of—'to be equal with God,' suggests another atmosphere, one foreign to such thoughts. When questions of this sort were put to Him He would answer them indirectly, or by another interrogation—'I also will ask you one question'—or in such a manner that 'no man from that day forth durst ask Him any more questions'; or He would outflank them when they were implied: 'Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God.' We shrink instinctively from bringing them into His presence; it would be an irreverence to do so. And, if we imagine the discovery of a lost Gospel, in which He was represented as asserting the beliefs formulated by the Councils as matters of fact and faith, the most conservative divines would at once pronounce it a forgery; it would be clearly impossible that He should have thought and spoken in this way. So that we may retort these questions on those who put them, and ask, '*Can* they be answered? *Can* anyone, even a theologian, know?'

(9) The neglect of the school of Antioch in the modern Churches has been a misfortune to their theology: this school supplied a balance which has been lost, and which must be restored. Of the two lines of thought which divided the Church of the Fathers on Christology the one, the Greek, accentuated Christ's Deity to an extent which made His humanity unreal and nominal; the other, the Syrian, while emphasizing the human, weakened the divine. The latter was the earlier of the

two. In the Gentile world the word God was used loosely; in the Jewish with rigour. The severe monotheism of Hebrew religion was intolerant of the notion of plurality in the Godhead; to the Jew this was unthinkable; and it was to the Jews that, in the first instance, the Gospel was preached. 'For this reason,' says St. Athanasius, 'the apostles with admirable wisdom preached τὰ ἀνθρωπίνα τοῦ Σωτῆρος the human qualities of the Saviour': Petavius adds 'only' the human qualities.[9] And, even after later Trinitarian conceptions had taken shape, we find the notion of a certain Monarchy in the Godhead opposed to that of plurality. There is a sense in which such a Monarchy must be held by Christians—the alternative being a lapse into polytheism—and is implied when Christ is spoken of as 'God, of God,' or as 'the Son of God.' It is an ineffectual and invertebrate theology which forgets this: 'for this cause many are weak and sickly among you; and many sleep.' What He claimed was a unique relation to and mission from God: and this claim was recognized not by His followers only, but, generally, by men of good will.

The words attributed to the centurion at the Crucifixion by two of the three evangelists who record his instinctive comment do not, of course, represent the developed speculation of the creeds; this would be an anachronism. But they are evidence of the impression made by the quality of the Crucified. He was One Who stood on an inexpressibly higher level than the normal level of humanity; to Whom Nature herself testified; Who was, in the sense in which He had Himself used the words, and in which they had been taken up by His enemies, 'a Son,' or 'the Son of God.' From this, it was a short step to the *Verbum caro factum est* of the Fourth Gospel. The difference is one of orientation, not of content: in the one case the link is seen from the manward, in the other from the Godward, side.

(10) What have later dogmatic developments, the speculative conclusions of theologians, stereotyped in the definitions of the Great Councils, added to this?

> 'It seems (says a great English teacher) to be an opinion which is gaining ground among thoughtful and religious men that, in theology, the less we define the better. Definite statements respecting the relation of Christ either to God or man, are only figures of

[9] *De Incarnatione*, I, 2. Harnack: *Dogmengeschichte*, I, p. 657.

speech; they do not really pierce the clouds which "round our little life." When we multiply words we do not multiply ideas; we are still within the circle of our own minds. No greater calamity has ever befallen the Christian Church than the determination of some uncertain things which are beyond the sphere of human knowledge.'[10]

We make a dust, and then complain that we cannot see for it. These discussions hinder rather than help religion, which is not a formula, but a disposition: they discredit faith, dissipate energy, weaken charity, stir up strife. We do well to fall back upon the words of the Psalmist, 'I do not exercise myself in great matters which are too high for me'; and on that of the Preacher, 'God is in heaven and thou on earth; therefore let thy words be few.'

(11) Such formulas as those of Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and the rest, were a 'hedge of the law,' designed not to proclaim new truths, but to exclude new errors: and, when the errors against which they were a protest passed away, they survived like fossil remains of earlier *strata* deposited in a new geological formation. But, though their value has become rather historical than actual, it is far from having disappeared. These successive stages show what has been believed among us, and the efforts which have been made to explain this belief: they serve as milestones on the long road that lies behind and stretches beyond us, which those who were before us have trodden, on which we now find ourselves, and which those who come after us will tread. Hence, because their roots lie so deep in the past, their high associational value. How many generations have prayed in these words! With what memories, with what affections are they not impregnated! With what emotions, with what tears are they not suffused! We do well to retain them. But, let us not confuse two orders. As knowledge, are they not attempts to meet questions which should not be asked, and cannot be answered? What have these formulas added to that great thought, a thought linking up Nature, Man and God in one unbroken harmony—'The Word was made flesh'? In its presence we are as children looking out over the limitless ocean of Being. Ineffable mystery! 'Who shall declare His generation?' It is enough that 'He dwelt among us; and we beheld His glory—the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'

[10] Jowett: Essay on Atonement and Satisfaction.

THE COMING MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc., author of *Religion and Science.*

THE Scientific Approach to Religion has the merit of being a clear title, and people will attend the 1924 Conference knowing what to expect. They will come hoping to hear from the lips of specialists in the various spheres (1) what the scientific situation is, and (2) what bearing it may have upon our religious beliefs.

The Conference Committee may be congratulated on having collected together as large a number of first-rate authorities as one would find anywhere short of a meeting of the British Association or Royal Society, and those who attend the Conference may at any rate feel satisfied that they will be put in possession of the facts. Some of the men of science present are also not undistinguished as philosophers, and they will be able, not only to give their audience the facts, but also to interpret them.

The sciences are generally divided into three classes—physical (those dealing with inanimate matter), biological (those dealing with organisms), and psychological (those dealing with the mental aspects of mind-endowed organisms, both animals and men).

It would have been natural to begin the Conference by listening to a physicist; but it is not until Wednesday that we reach this point. The first full day—Tuesday—is occupied with the discussion of what appears at first sight to be a strictly biological subject, *Evolution, a vital phenomenon*; but the title of the second paper of the morning, *The Possibility of Purpose*, indicates that it will be the business of the first day to afford some suggestions as to the point of view from which we are to regard the truths which subsequent papers will bring before us. Yet the readers of these two opening papers are

primarily men of science, Professor Macbride a distinguished zoologist and embryologist, and Professor Adami well known to all medical students as the author of a *Text-book of Pathology* (1912), which is both indispensable and out of print, and therefore (like Bradley's *Ethical Studies* a short while ago) a prize for extortionate second-hand booksellers; and also as a contributor to Sir William Osler's *Modern Medicine*. Both these scientific authorities, however, are known to take an interest in problems of religion, and Dr. Adami has recently published an essay on *The Unity of the Churches* (1923).

The evening paper, by Professor W. G. de Burgh, of University College, Reading, deals with a more definitely philosophical subject; but the question of the validity, and ultimate truth, of our moral and religious ideals is bound to be raised by biological and psychological science, and it is well, at the outset, to examine some of the foundations upon which they rest. Prof. W. R. Sorley's *Gifford Lectures*, from which the title of Prof. de Burgh's paper has been borrowed by the Conference Committee, should prove good preparatory reading here.

On Wednesday, the astronomer and the physicist may be expected to give us a *resumé* of the latest theories—so far as these may be comprehensible to those not familiar with the technicalities of the subject, which, of course, are fairly abstruse. We shall no doubt learn something of the new ideas of space involved in the Einstein theory, and also of the new notions of matter which have developed since the discovery of radio-activity more than twenty years ago. *The Recent Development of Physical Science* (1909), by Mr. W. C. D. Whetham—a member of the Churchmen's Union—is a book which, though written some years ago, is to be recommended in this connection, as also is that excellent manual in the *Home University Library* series, *Matter and Energy*, by Professor F. Soddy.

The evening paper on Wednesday deals with a subject of the very highest importance. Dr. Tennant has made his speciality the study of the problems raised by naturalistic determinism for the moral and religious consciousness; and in very close

connection with it will be the first paper on Saturday morning, by another Hulsean Lecturer, the Rev. C. F. Russell. In these two papers we shall get to grips with the real problem presented by modern science, which is not a problem raised by this or that discovery, but by the scientific method itself, which deliberately declines to recognize 'freedom' in psychology any more than in physics. And Mr. Russell's paper, furthermore, cannot overlook the pressing problem of the validity of the category of the supernatural, and will tell us what, if any, meaning the term can have for us to-day. In this connection his *Religion and Natural Law* (1924), reviewed in the June *Modern Churchman*, should be read.

On Thursday we move on to biology. This science, in every sphere, is a battlefield—whether in genetics, physiology, or embryology. Prof. Haldane's views are well known, and are expressed in a number of books, of which *Mechanism, Life, and Personality* (1911) is perhaps the most widely read. His own researches in physiology have led Prof. Haldane to deny that the behaviour of organisms can be completely expressed in terms of chemistry and physics: he holds that new categories, such as life and purpose, are required if we are to give a *complete* explanation of the facts. Yet the question is still hotly disputed. A most valuable and easily-read pamphlet, and one which sheds a clear light on the problems at issue, is a *Symposium* of the Aristotelian Society (1917), entitled *Are Physical, Biological, and Psychological Categories Irreducible?* to which besides Prof. Haldane, Profs. D'Arcy Thomson, P. Chalmers Mitchell, and L. T. Hobhouse contribute. An extraordinarily readable and fascinating book dealing with this department of science is Prof. J. A. Thomson's *System of Animate Nature* (Gifford Lectures, 1920), and indeed any of his numerous works are readable and valuable, notably his book on *Evolution* (written in conjunction with Sir Patrick Geddes) in the Home University Library (1912).

Professor Lloyd Morgan, of Bristol, a well-known authority on animal psychology, has until recently stubbornly declined to express any opinion upon what he has described as 'problems of source'; but in his recent Gifford Lectures, *Emergent*

Evolution, he comes out on the side of 'purpose' in an unmistakeable fashion. Those who attend the Conference will listen with exceptional interest to the utterance of this high authority on what is *the* scientific problem of the day: Are life and mind reducible to, and explicable in, terms of chemistry and physics?

The results of biological research, especially in the regions of the development of mind and personality, naturally have a bearing upon the problem of immortality, and we may rely on Mr. Turner to place the issues before us in the clearest possible fashion.

On Friday we arrive among the stormy seas of Anthropology and Psychology. These are new sciences and are, for many, as terrifying in their results as were the New Physics of Galileo for his contemporaries, or the New Biology of Darwin for our grandfathers. What has the history of religion to say of the religious consciousness? Its origins are known, its beginnings were crude enough, and even in its developed condition it can be represented by a hostile psychology as a form of neurosis. It is upon these problems that Prof. Webb and Mr. Hadfield will be expected to shed light. The former is certainly a philosopher who has made a special study of anthropology, as indeed must all students of religion. Mr. Hadfield, who established his reputation in treating shell-shocked patients during the war, is known to attach high value to religious beliefs, and is one of the foremost popular exponents of the connection between religion and physical health.

Mr. Hadfield's paper will raise the whole question of prayer, and it may certainly be said that there is no one who is more competent to deal with that subject than Canon Streeter. The title, *Creative Prayer* (which we believe is his own, and not the Committee's), indicates that he will treat prayer as an actual and effective force, not as a mere form of spiritual or mental hygiene.

It is possible that Mr. Richard Hanson's paper on Saturday evening may summarize conclusions reached by earlier readers. His title suggests one, perhaps the only, method by which the material world can be represented as being in the

genuine sense spiritual. As a vehicle of spiritual values it is sacramental.

The Conference, then, should provide us with first-hand information, and with many stimulating ideas. We shall deceive ourselves, however, if we believe that *The Scientific Approach to Religion* will take us further than it claims to do, *i.e.* to the threshold of the really pressing problems. For to-day the question is not so much one of the attitude of the natural sciences towards religion in general, nor even of the attitude of the natural sciences towards our own particular religion, but of the attitude of one particular science—the science of history—towards traditional presentations of Christianity. This is the *live* issue, here it is that the battle is being fought, here it is also that clear and straightforward statements are rare. Social problems can be treated in safety, even problems of psychology can be discussed with impunity by clergymen, and a strict Roman Catholic may to-day, without fear of ecclesiastical censure, embrace the latest results of physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy, biology—some of the leading astronomers are Jesuits, and Mendel, the founder of modern genetics, was an Abbé; but if, like Loisy, he seeks, from the strictly scientific standpoint, to examine the origins of Christianity, the atmosphere changes and the thunder of ecclesiastical censure detonates overhead. The parallel in our own Church is exact.

If this Conference stands alone without its logical and necessary successor, it will leave us in mid-air. It can be preparation only. Another year, as in 1921, the *historical* problems which beset the Modernist must be faced. To decline to face them would be equivalent to something between abdication and stagnation.

THE TEMPLE NOT MADE WITH HANDS

By the Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE.

MANY years ago the late Alfred Ainger, in one of those polished discourses in the Temple Church with which he used to help many a tired lawyer in his journey through life, once startled the orthodoxy of his audience by telling them that if they sometimes went out in the fields and just thought on God, it might be better than going to Church. It was a bold thing to say at the date when he uttered it, but it contained a profound truth.

There is a grain of mysticism in most of us, and many are mystics without knowing it. For it is an attitude of mind which varies in conviction and intensity with the nature of the individual. There are not many of us, like Stevenson's Mackay, who can see nothing in the world but money and machinery, for in the majority of mankind there is some chord, some answering thrill, to which the harmony and beauty of Nature will give some sort of appeal. The sympathy with, and wonder at, natural objects seems to have found its earliest expression in the writings of the prophets of the Old Testament, and they have left us an imperishable garner of poetry and philosophy setting forth man's relationship with God as revealed in Nature.

The Book of Job is perhaps the best instance. You cannot read it without recognizing how modern the writer is. In relating a comparatively short episode in a long and happy life, he deals honestly with the problem which has ever troubled mankind, why injustice is permitted by a just God. The pros and cons are put with frankness, appealing to human reason, and coming to no conclusion till Elihu, the young man, bursts forth to proclaim the effect of suffering, bravely borne, upon the character. But the argument throughout is supported by the most memorable statements of man's place in Nature, and his relation to the universe. 'Which maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the South : which doeth great things past finding out : Yea, and wonders without number. Lo ! he goeth by me, and I see him not.' And out of the despair

caused by the detrition and decay that he sees going on in Nature, which 'destroy the hope of man,' rings out the prophetic song of hope in words which crystallized the instinct of the human race from the beginning, and which have brought consolation to millions: 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.'

The same appeal to the universe as conveying the message of God to man runs throughout the Old Testament. But, curiously enough, Nature seems to have dropped out of religious teaching during apostolic times with the exception of Him Who pointed to the lilies of the field as symbols of creative Providence and beheld in the beauty of Nature a Heavenly Father's love. The apostles, moreover, gathered into cities for the purpose of their ministry, or strenuously journeying from place to place, took no thought apparently of lilies, being too much occupied with the internal affairs of the Church, garnering souls, and plucking brands from the burning. Thus, in early Christian times, with a few notable exceptions, we hear little of the religious appeal of Nature to man, save as affording the solitude in which an anchorite might dwell and meditate. In the Middle Ages, if we except the Franciscan Movement, men received their inspiration, not so much from rural beauty hurried through in company for safety's sake in troublous times, as from the abbeys and cathedrals decked by the consummate art of man, and the colour of gorgeous ritual. The troubadours were more exercised in singing the perfection of their mistresses than the beautiful lands through which they wandered. However, it was again the province of poetry, beginning in England with Chaucer, to point out the beauty of Nature and the wild, and many, like Traherne and Herbert, perceived the religious significance of that beauty. England was the garden in which God walked.

But it is not always through beauty that Nature speaks to us, for savagery has its message as well. There is no reason why we should not perceive God in the whirlwind and the thunder before we hear the still, small voice. Wordsworth was mainly influenced by the quiet beauty of the Lake District, and that he has revealed to us in immortal verse. I suspect that he wished Nature to be ever smiling, just as Richard Jefferies revolted from some of the ugly forms of creation and desired

them to be more human. But there is a spice of egotism, or false idealism, in this view, for Nature can be savage and ugly just as human beings can be cruel and revolting. There is a glorious majesty in a big storm amid rocky precipices. 'God shall touch the hills and they shall smoke,' and though 50,000 beings are blotted out, an eruption cannot be separated from the divine scheme: it is but the discord which gives value to the theme in the symphony, which value we do not perceive because our range of vision is so finite. There is really no absolute canon of beauty in Nature: we only admire what we see, and fortunately none of us sees alike, just as two artists will sit down before the same landscape and produce totally different effects:

> 'Two men looked out through prison bars,
> One saw mud, the other stars.'

All of us if we choose can, like Blake, 'See a World in a grain of Sand and a heaven in a Wild Flower,' and some of us do. Let us compare the feeling towards the outside world and the taste for the open with what it was in olden times, and it will be found that the sermons in stones are beginning to be listened to, and that Nature is speaking to us more directly and insistently than ever before. Our ears are being trained to admire the discords as well as the harmonies.

For a true appreciation of the Divine message of Nature we must 'delight to be alone and single with Omnipresence.' A companion, however sympathetic, will mar the ecstacy of the experience. All those who have given us the best interpretations have been single with Omnipresence. 'The man I meet with is not often so instructive as the silence that he breaks.' Thoreau fled from the tittle tattle of the tea table, and found peace in listening to the bobolink singing round his pond in the forest, and in watching the steam of the distant train in the valley below, and who shall say he was not the better for it? We are, for he gave us *Walden*. Nature talked no nonsense to him, for she never does. She is ever giving us truths of perpetual delight, 'and wondered things become the things that are.' It is only when alone, haply in some smiling scene, haply on some rugged mountain top, that we feel stealing over us a close touch

of unity with our surroundings, an abiding sense of being part of the great scheme of Creation. It was not by chance that great messages were delivered to Moses and Elijah on the tops of mountains, for they are the sacred places of the earth, unploughed, unaltered by man, and fashioned by the finger of God. It was such a feeling that inspired the wishes of both Rhodes and Stevenson, men of widely different natures, to be buried on a hill. Thus, solitude may be had almost anywhere for the asking, if it is sought, for 'a thicket may be as secret as a forest.' Man has two instincts in him, one for the pack, the other for solitude, therefore it is good for us if we do not let the one swamp the other. And it is chiefly when alone and in the open that a consciousness of the Presence, of a Supreme Power pervading the whole universe, and dwelling in man as part of it, comes over the mystic. It is then that he feels that 'the sun is his brother and the moon his sister,' and that he is akin to the animal kingdom. 'For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field: and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee.'

This idea of Omnipresence is apt to arise in opposition to any elaborate system of ritual as a natural counter-tendency towards simplicity in religion. Formalism, no doubt, has its valuable uses in holding men together in corporate worship, but the divine call of God in solitary places, the indwelling and brooding of His will over the universe, in spite of the apparent cruelty which repels and the incongruities which puzzle us, will always appeal to man. It crops up again and again through the ages. In the dawn of history we hear of Zeno coming from the Phoenician coast to expound this doctrine to the Athenians who were ever open to new impressions. Its very simplicity was a relief to those who were weary of the confused hierarchy of gods and goddesses. The multiplicity of objects of devotion, and their limited jurisdiction over sections of the earth, would naturally induce a sceptical attitude of mind among the enlightened. They felt a difficulty in distributing a heart's worship towards all and sundry, and realized that devotion must be single to be true, and so they accepted the new doctrine that temples were unnecessary because nothing fashioned by man could be worthy of the Deity.

The parallel between this doctrine and that of Paul, a native of Tarsus in the same district of Phoenicia, who said the same thing centuries later, is so obvious that it has been suggested by Mr. Edwyn Bevan in his *Stoics and Sceptics* that the writer of *The Acts* deliberately put into the mouth of the apostle phraseology relating back to the teaching of Zeno. And it would be natural that Paul, a man of culture, should use the language of ancient philosophy to an Athenian audience. Thus it happened that twice the stones of the Athenian *agora* rang with this teaching which sprang up like a seed which had lain dormant in the earth. And it has sprouted many times since under favourable conditions.

There must ever be an antagonism between symbolism and naturalism, though they both point to the same end by different paths. The distraction of this world and its formulae, the importance assigned to ritual, and the elaboration of sacred buildings, sometimes drive men into the fields, just as the desire to escape from sin and its contamination drove hermits into the desert. Solitude is apt to simplify matters of faith, and communion with Nature is a great solvent of doubt. The harmony and cohesion of the great processes of natural forces tend to have a soothing effect on those impatient of human media of worship. They go out and hymn the Almighty in the light of the sun, and recognize the wind of His blessing.

But the faith of the average man requires reminders, his soul demands symbols, he must have a dolmen, the spires and towers of his cathedrals and churches are signposts to heaven wherever he goes, he keeps a priestly class as skilled guides, he must perform his devotions at regular intervals or he would perform none at all, and he likes to do it in company. The mechanical aspect of his religion has become so important, and he associates it so exclusively with places of worship, that he is prone to forget the temple which is not made with hands. God is not in the earthquake, nor in the whirlwind, so he goes to church for the still, small voice. It requires no little imagination to feel God in Fleet Street or in the Stock Exchange, and *that* the average man does not possess. It is only in moments of rare detachment that the laughing glitter of the sea, the solemnity of the forest, or the glory of

the mountain top suggest to him in short flashes that there is a Power beyond his ken that fashions the earth and its beauty. It is in these divine moments that man comes to perceive at once his true relationship to the universe, his kinship with the Divine. His soul is enlarged with the sense of wonder at the wealth of loveliness around him, and he is humiliated at his own insignificance. The ocean glittered in golden wavelets before man was, the primeval forest was as solemn and eloquent as any present wood, that hill-top represents but a worn-down fragment of its former size, and will continue to be scarred by detrition till the end of time, unless some cataclysm should occur to shake the surface of the earth. Great nations have run their course on the globe and disappeared, leaving nought but a pyramid or ruin to tell of their existence, and we have to piece together the scattered tesserae of conjecture to find out the pattern of their life.

And we, with our science, education and progress—all that we connote by the term civilization—are we better than ancients? We are surely better through the knowledge that we are part of a system of slow growth and evolution, a system so vast that its Author sometimes seems too remote to be approached by personal worship. But even if we take worship at its lowest valuation, we shall find a moral and intellectual tonic in comparing ourselves with something higher and greater—comparison lying at the root of veneration—still more if we arrogate to ourselves, as we are entitled to do, the first place on this earth in the order of Divine intelligence, then, indeed, we may rejoice in being partakers of His kingdom. Then we may approach that almost triumphant calm displayed by Dr. Wilson at his coming fate, and chronicled by Captain Scott in imperishable words: 'His eyes have a comfortable look of hope, and his mind is peaceful with the satisfaction of his faith in regarding himself as part of the Great Scheme of the Almighty.'

THE THEOLOGY OF A RECENT REPORT

By Canon Tollinton, D.D.

THE Report of the Archbishop's Committee on the Ministry of Healing is an important statement, but it is also an exceedingly cautious one. It has been difficult to criticize, just because it says so little. Perhaps the truest estimate was that of the *Observer*, which journal on January 20th described the Report as 'a meagre result.'

No doubt it may be said that a Report to which twenty signatures, unanimously given with one slight reservation, are attached, is likely to be meagre. The measure of assent on a highly debateable subject to be found in a Committee whose membership is so extremely varied has natural, almost inevitable, limits. Allowing this, it will still be felt that the Report has serious omissions. It gives us, for example, no full discussion of the importance to be attached to, or of the interpretation to be placed upon, our Lord's many utterances upon the subject, utterances which in some cases involve considerable difficulty. Again, the sections (59-63) of the Lambeth Report, 1920, out of which this Committee arose, are headed 'Christian Science.' We would gladly have known what the Committee think about Christian Science. We may guess, sometimes even infer, their opinion. But we are not told. Also the Committee state that they have not felt called upon to examine witnesses from the United States or the British Dominions. We are sure they had excellent reasons for their decision. But the omission which it involves is again a serious one.

Implicitly, however, with all their caution, the Archbishop's Committee have made, as it seems to us, a somewhat far-reaching theological suggestion, which has hardly received the attention it deserves. It affects our standpoint towards Physical Evil.

In some ways physical evil presents a more difficult problem than moral evil. For in regard to the latter it may be said that man could not attain to spiritual maturity without freedom and that, freedom being given him, he misused it, blundered and fell. *Hinc illae lacrymae*, from the apple of Mother Eve to the tragedy of the Great War. No such explanation is adequate in

the case of physical evil, however often it may be true in individual instances that material consequences follow moral fault. The cruelty, *e.g.* of the struggle for existence is independent of moral issues and chronologically anterior to them. Perhaps there are few theodicies more futile than that of the friends of Job, who were so evidently anxious to relieve the creative forces of the universe of their responsibility for their own operation.

Most of us, confronted with the facts of pain, disease and other physical ills, have probably said that these things are caused or permitted by God as a part of the discipline of life. They are, with Browning :

> 'Machinery just meant
> To give thy soul its bent.'

If we could see all, all would be well. So faith could 'triumph in conclusive bliss,' and all suffering be justified by results. The Greeks sometimes held this theory; *παθεῖν μαθεῖν*. And Christian people have made even more abundant use of it.

In some cases the theory is obviously true. Suffering does educate. But is the explanation adequate? Does it not at times stretch faith to the breaking-point and draw dangerously long bills upon the future for compensation and redress? Judging provisionally, as of course we must, but still judging, it is simply not true that all suffering results in good. After all, a spoiled life is a spoiled life, with whatever care and high purpose we may treasure and utilize the fragments. Moreover, it is difficult for a man whose wife is dying of cancer to appeal for either remedy or consolation to the Power by whose order or permission he believes the disease to be at work. The appeal elicited is more likely to be the old one, heard even in the days when the world was young :

> *Ζεῦ πάτερ . . . .*
> *οὐκ ἐλεαίρεις ἄνδρας, ἐπὴν δὴ γείνεαι αὐτός;*

Incidentally, let us be careful not to exaggerate the difference between divine causation and divine permission. The Report (p. 14) lays stress on this distinction. But surely, where a Sovereign Power is in question, the difference between willing and permitting becomes a very superficial one.

In any case, the signatories of this Report are clearly not of opinion that the physical ills of humanity are attributable to the

will of God. Disease, they reiterate, is an evil. Health is God's primary will for all His children. The language used in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick should, we are told, be reconsidered, and no doubt such reconsideration would eliminate the characteristic statement, 'Wherefore, whatsoever your sickness is, know you certainly, that it is God's visitation.' The changes proposed in this Office by the compilers of the Grey Book are well worth noting. The Bishop of Saint Albans seems to have been entirely justified in his statement in Convocation (*Times*, May 8th) that the whole of the Committee's Report was based on the belief that sickness could no more be said to be the will of God than sin.

Now, where does this lead us? If pain and sickness are not due to the will of God, where else shall we look for their origin? It is not sufficient to say, 'This is a mystery we cannot understand.' Some view and standpoint, however provisional, we must have. The great merit of Christian Science is that it has faced the problem, however impossible of acceptance may be its answer, that these things do not really exist. Most of us would thankfully accept this solution, if cold and sober reason would allow. Failing that, and ruling out, with the Report, the old theory that physical evil is sent for our good, what explanation is left? Are we not landed in a provisional dualism? If God wills health, disease is alien to the will of God and must come from an alien source. This carries you a long way, almost as far as the old theory that God was limited by matter or by necessity. The implication is that side by side with the divine power another agency is at work, arresting the divine will, laying unmerited burdens upon humanity, thwarting upon the physical plane the forces that make for welfare. Our faith in an ultimate extinction, even of physical evil, may be strong and inspiring. Not the less do we live for the present in a world which in many of its aspects it is impossible to regard as a manifestation or expression of the will of God. If we again remind ourselves that this is not to be accounted for on the ground of the frailty of human nature, it is sufficiently obvious that the theological implications are serious and far-reaching. They do not leave wholly unaffected our conception of the Divine Sovereignty. They qualify our belief in Providence. This appears

to be an inevitable inference from the fundamental principle of this Report.

The position we are left in with a limited, and not merely self-limited, God, is not a satisfactory one, but it accords in some ways with the teaching of our Lord and with human experience.

Our Lord's attitude to physical evil has hardly received sufficient attention. Take the case of the woman mentioned in the thirteenth chapter of Saint Luke. There is no suggestion of any divine discipline, no hint that in reality all was ordained for good. Jesus speaks of her simply as 'this woman whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years.' He regards her case as one which ought not so to be, and heals her, Sabbath as it was, on this ground. He views disease just as He views the tares in the parable; 'an enemy hath done this.' And whatever may have been our Lord's belief about demoniacal possession, it is sufficiently evident that in all such cases He acted as regarding the sick or possessed person as under the control of an alien and hostile power, that He had no shadow of suspicion that in effecting their liberation He might be interfering with His Father's purpose. His position indeed is exactly that of this Report. Disease is an evil. There is no blessing in disguise about it. We need not again draw the inferences.

And experience in some of its phases leads towards a like conclusion. The supreme difficulty for Christian faith, a difficulty by the side of which the problems of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection become trivial, is that of reconciling our knowledge of the Unseen Power which comes to us through nature, circumstances, history, with our Lord's teaching of the Divine Fatherhood. On the one hand, at the back of experience, is this Unseen Power at work, so magnificently efficient, so utterly fair, so relentlessly advancing towards the achievement of some inscrutable purpose, yet also so entirely devoid of love, compassion, response to the human cry. On the other is our Father in Heaven, united with His children by the ties of love and knowledge, the Saviour, Guide and Friend of humanity, a God Who understands our infirmities, Who can hear our prayers. The one conception is in the main scientific, the other religious. The one comes from Nature, the other from

he Spirit. Between them is contrast, even conflict. Marcion and Lucretius among the ancients, J. S. Mill and Huxley among the moderns, have felt the difficulty of their reconciliation. Christian teachers have only too often ignored the problem. The same antithesis underlies this Report on the Ministry of Healing, with its frank recognition of physical evil as at variance with the will of God. That is a particular phase of an abiding problem. The dark facts are there. Yet the Christian even more than the Platonist must stand by the principle of the utter goodness of God. *Θεὸς ἀναίτιος κακίας.* The coming Conference of Modern Churchmen is to deal with the Scientific Approach to Religion. The occasion will merit lasting memory, if it may minister in any substantial degree towards the discovery of the long-sought harmony between experience and faith.

IMMANUEL KANT*

'Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice.'—*St. John* xviii, 37.

I PROPOSE to speak to you to-day on an unusual subject. On April 22nd occurred the 200th anniversary of the birth of Immanuel Kant, and I will venture to take the life and work of this great thinker as the text of my observations this morning. In most places it would perhaps be inappropriate to deal with a subject so far outside the ordinary topics of Christian exhortation, but in this chapel it should need no apology. This ancient Inn has become associated with the name of philosophy because of the immortal fame of the greatest of its sons—Francis Bacon. That great genius was the herald, the prophet, and the inaugurator of a new era in human knowledge and speculation. He stands at the beginning of a fresh movement of the spirit of man, and lays down in noble words its programme and ideal. Immanuel Kant is without question the most important and the most characteristic personality which the new movement produced. Moreover, he is himself one of the creative and formative minds of all history. He stands in the small

* A Sermon preached in Gray's Inn on Sunday, April 27th, 1924, by the Rev. Professor R. W. Matthews, D.D., Preacher at Gray's Inn.

company of minds that includes Plato and Aristotle, and very few others. Millions who have never heard his name think differently because he lived. There is no single mind that has contributed more powerfully to the civilization and the world of ideas in which we live.

I began by bringing together the names of Kant and Bacon. But though they are fellow-workers in the building up of the great edifice of human knowledge, though both may be described in the expressive phrase of our text as being 'of the truth,' yet in most other respects they are in strong contrast. Our own philosopher was a man of the world and a man of affairs. To him was given the glory of a great place in the eyes of men, great wealth and power, and familiar converse with the prominent minds of the age. The shadows that lie in the memory of Bacon arise from his too great love for the things of that intoxicating world in which he lived. The pride of intellect and the glory of life made it difficult for him to hear always the voice of conscience and duty.

Very different was the outer fortune of his greater successor. Kant was the son of a poor tradesman in Königsberg. His early years were passed in poverty and obscurity. For some years he was compelled to act as private tutor in wealthy families who lived near his home. It is a melancholy reflection that the greatest intellect of the age spent some of the best years of his life in the drudgery of elementary tuition. When recognition came to him it came in the modest form of a Professorship at Königsberg. And there he remained for the rest of his life, never going more than thirty miles from the town of his birth, without ambition and without discontent; pursuing a life of clockwork regularity, teaching, studying, and writing: devoted to the discovery of truth, the standing example of those who are 'of the truth.'

Not less remarkable is the difference between the intellectual tasks which confronted the two great thinkers. Bacon came as the proclaimer of a great new vision. His message was one of unfathomable optimism. Cast off the old prejudices of mediaeval thought. Apply the new methods of investigation to the study of nature. Illimitable vistas of knowledge open up with inconceivable promise for the 'betterment of man's estate.'

Nor did it occur to these thinkers that the new knowledge would jeopardize the authority of religion. Many foolish superstitions no doubt would be discarded; but the larger knowledge of creation could only make more clear the existence and the power of the Creator.

When Kant appeared the scene had radically changed. The host which had advanced so confidently under Bacon's leadership now looked like a defeated army. The movement of thought which began with Bacon ended with our last great English philosopher, David Hume. He was the heir of the tradition: he summed it up. And what was his conclusion? The movement ended in a reasoned and deliberate scepticism: in a complete denial of the very possibility of knowledge. Not only could we not know God, but we could not know the world. Science and theology were equally confounded. Kant himself tells us that it was the reading of Hume that awoke him from his 'dogmatic slumbers.' It was the need to grapple with this situation that nerved him to his supreme and prolonged intellectual effort. He had two problems to solve. To show how we can gain a real knowledge of nature, and to place, if possible, religion on an unassailable foundation.

It would of course be quite beyond the limits of a sermon to attempt even to sketch the profound and complex train of thought which Kant painfully evolved. But it is possible to draw attention to the qualities of mind and character which he manifested. They at least are open to our admiration and imitation.

Nothing is more impressive than the steadfast candour and patient honesty with which his mind moves. He never shirks a difficulty or minimizes an objection. He is always 'of the truth'; desiring to know the truth, confident that nothing can be so good as to know that.

These noble characteristics of mind are exemplified perhaps most of all in that aspect of his work which specially concerns us—in his treatment of religion. Kant approached this question with grave seriousness. He was no mere indifferent speculator. Religion meant a great deal to him. He had been brought up in the circle of German pietism, and the quiet devoutness of that simple and fine religion had entered into his

soul. He wanted to believe in God, Freedom and Immortality. But nevertheless when he examined the arguments on which these beliefs had been supported, the argument from design and the other traditional lines of thought, he was compelled to see that they would not bear the weight which had been put upon them. He did not compromise to allow his desire to cloud his intellectual insight. The insufficiency of these reasonings must be recognized and proclaimed.

It was this intellectual honesty which led him to the great discovery and suggestion which has revolutionized religious thought. Kant was led to see that the great affirmations of religion are really based in the moral consciousness. God, Freedom and Immortality are postulates of the conscience. It is useless to reason with a man who has no moral experience on these themes. Religion is based on moral faith.

This shifting of the stress from the pure intellect to the practical reason, this clear insight that spiritual religion is concerned with values, has been epoch making. It is hardly too much to say that it has made belief in God and in Christianity possible for generations of educated men.

Though Kant had thus vindicated the right to believe, and rescued religion from the quagmires of intellectualism and scepticism, it cannot be said that he himself ever reached any glad assurance. What strikes us most about him when we compare him with other saints and leaders of the spirit is the absence of joy from his experience. Perhaps he saw too clearly the difficulties which lie in the path of confident assertion. Perhaps the gigantic effort of mind, carried on for the greater part of a life-time, weighed him down. The divine appeared to him almost entirely in the guise of duty. His highest service was to obey the categorical imperative that spoke in his soul. And this he did unwaveringly and unflinchingly. The man who exalted the moral consciousness to the highest place in philosophy, exalted it also to the highest place in himself.

Brethren, we do well to honour this great thinker as one of God's servants. It is a mistake to think that only those who have been canonized by the Church and who have used the language of conventional piety, are owned by Christ as His followers. He who declared that those who were of the truth

heard His voice would recognize this servant of the truth as not far from His kingdom.

This little German professor has a message for us to-day. He has a message in his thought and in the example of his life. In his thought he shows us the need for a faith that dares to enquire. Kant re-established religious life because he had the courage to face the difficulties with absolute intellectual honesty, and to dig below them for a secure foundation. That is a message that is needed in every time, but never more than to-day. We are living in an intellectual atmosphere not unlike that which Kant found. The traditional teaching of the Church has, in many points, become almost unintelligible for the modern mind. The modern view of the world has never been incorporated with Christian teaching. How are we going to deal with the situation? The settled policy of the ecclesiastic has always been to keep the machine going: to patch up the damaged dogmas here and there, to cover over intellectual bankruptcy with catchwords and meaningless phrases of a pious sound.

Kant's example reminds us that we can never 'heal the hurt of God's people lightly.' Nothing but absolute intellectual honesty, a clear-eyed facing of the real position, can bring us into security once again. And this means that the Church must tolerate and even encourage thinkers, a race of men towards which her attitude has been too often one of suspicion. Kant himself was looked at askance by the Church of his day, and reprimanded for his unorthodox views. Little did the ecclesiastics think that the man whom they wrote down as 'dangerous' was really performing the work that was most urgent for the Church, securing ground on which religion could stand as an intellectually respectable doctrine. So it is to-day. The momentarily effective thing, appears to be the vitally important thing. But it is not so. The future of religion is being determined, not by organization, or clever rhetoric, or mass emotion, but by thought; it depends on whether our faith can be so thought out afresh as to be made agreeable with the growing knowledge of mankind. Of men like Kant we may say, 'Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved.'

The actual solutions which Kant worked out will not, in all

their details, suffice for our needs. Each generation must meet its own problems. The world has moved on since Kant lived. But the line which he marked out will remain, we may confidently predict, the true line of progress for religious thinking. We shall come more and more to see how profoundly right Kant was when he based faith on conscience, and staked the truth of religion on the validity of moral judgment.

The life of Kant speaks to me, at any rate, two clear messages. The first is to people of cold and critical and cautious minds. We feel (do we not) sometimes left out of the warm life of humanity. We see others happy with phrases and beliefs that only cause us to question and doubt, we see others apparently enjoying direct and satisfying contact with the Divine. We envy these happy souls, while we push along as best we can, full of perplexities, holding fast only to the gleam that we know, oppressed by the mystery that is all around. The life of Kant can assure us that God has a use for us. The most permanent spiritual force in the eighteenth century was not any happy warrior of the ideal or mystic rapt in unspeakable visions. The greatest spiritual force of that age was a prosaic little professor, who manfully and honestly and unceasingly grappled with the intellectual problems of the time, holding fast to the clue which he found in the idea of duty. God sometimes chooses the weak, yes even the weak in spiritual gifts, to confound the strong.

And when I contemplate this life, outwardly so dull and undistinguished, I gain a profound conviction of the majesty of the human soul. The mind of this man in his little German town contemplated all space and time, and surveyed the very secrets of being. He thought, in a measure, the very thoughts of God. He was great and noble, because he cared for truth more than for anything else. He loved truth more than most men love pleasure or comfort or honour or wealth. And therefore God fulfilled Himself through him.

And this surely is true greatness, this is the real life of the spirit, to fill one's life with values that are eternal, to care for truth and beauty and the Kingdom of God above all else: that is to share the life of God who is Truth and Light and Love, and to be the instrument of God's fulfilment.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DECALOGUE IN THE LIGHT OF TO-DAY*

It was customary to regard the Ten Commandments as the oldest legal code in existence, and as infinitely the most sacred as having been spoken by God Himself from the top of Mount Sinai. Modern historical research now teaches that the Code of Hammurabi, promulgated about 2300 B.C., is probably a thousand years older than the Decalogue: modern religious psychology teaches that the utterances of the Divine Voice are heard in the heart of man, but not with the ear of sense. Hence the Decalogue was spoken by God to Israel not in a voice of thunder from the rugged top of Sinai, but in the moral, and spiritual, and rational, consciousness of the nation through the utterances of prophets and legislators. With the changed outlook the Decalogue has lost for some its ancient majesty and also something of its legal authority. Dr. R. H. Charles' Warburtonian Lectures will, however, do not a little to arouse fresh interest in the Decalogue.

These lectures are a striking example of the power of research to give us back in a more vital and arresting form what custom has staled and over-emphasis discredited. We all know, though we cannot emulate Dr. Charles' learning, and that learning is everywhere evident in his latest volume. We hope, however, that it will not frighten the unlearned, although we fear it may. It is most in evidence in the Introduction. It is a pity that Dr. Charles did not write this introduction in that popular style of which he gives us so good an example in his book *Between the Testaments,* and relegate the technicalities of scholarship to an appendix. We say this from no desire to be critical, but lest readers who are not scholars should decline to read a book which in all other respects is very clear, simple, and practical, because its 272 pages of popular instruction are prefaced by some 64 pages of introduction which only a scholar can appreciate.

Dr. Charles points out, what few ordinary Christians seem aware of, that the Decalogue is preserved in two different forms in the Old Testament; one in *Exodus* xx, the other in *Deuteronmy* v, while quite another Decalogue is preserved in *Exodus* xxxiv, the exact relation of which to the two others is at present unsettled. In some form the Decalogues of *Ex.* xx and *Deut.* v go back to Moses, and it is of importance to note as it indicates the growing ascendancy of a sane Old Testament criticism that Dr. Charles holds, that the essential element in each commandment, when stripped of later accretions, is in all probability Mosaic.

The first step towards discovering what these accretions are is to compare the Decalogue of *Ex.* 20 with *Deut.* v. This comparison indicates that the two Decalogues agree in commandments I, III, VI, VII, VIII, but differ in the other five. We may not outline here the ingenious and convincing arguments by which Dr. Charles reaches his general conclusion that the Mosaic Decalogue goes back to 1300 B.C. or earlier, and that originally each commandment consisted of one short clause. We hope that our Prayer Book revisers will take careful note of Dr. Charles' research, and will give us in our revised Communion Office and Catechism the Decalogue in what is in all probability its original form, a form better suited for modern liturgical purposes than that which we have at present.

* *The Decalogue* (The Warburton Lectures, 1919–1923). By Archdeacon R. H. CHARLES, D.D., F.B.A. (T. & T. Clark, 1923; 7/6.)

We have no space here to deal with Dr. Charles' exposition and practical application of the Ten Commandments. It combines in a very remarkable way historical knowledge and critical insight with deep moral and spiritual emotion. We cull a passage from his exposition of the Tenth Commandment, which will indicate that the scholar does not necessarily live in a world which is remote from actuality.

> 'There are two organisations of workers who have undertaken to solve the labour problem of the present day. These are the Socialists and the Syndicalists . . . The public have not learnt to distinguish the legitimate Socialist from the Syndicalist. The latter has no claim to the designation Socialist in any sense . . . The Socialists are reformers working on legitimate lines, and as such they send their representatives to Parliament. They are, or should be, in the main constructive. Their aim is to build up a new nation. They seek by legislation to reform society and to emancipate the State from the control of narrow individual groups . . . The Syndicalist movement originated with the more impatient, rapacious, and fanatical Socialists, to whom constitutional methods seemed slow and ineffective . . . Their interests are not political, but economic. They are working, not for the advantage of the nation, but of certain groups within the nation. In short, they are mainly selfish . . . They expect to achieve this end by limitation of output and constant strikes, and where these fail by violence and sabotage. Strikes in the hands of the earlier Socialists were undertaken to secure better wages and better conditions of labour and distribution, and when such objects were secured, these Socialists felt themselves morally bound to observe the covenants by which they had secured them. But the Syndicalists acknowledge no moral obligations, they teach that such covenants are not binding, they declare them to be nothing better but scraps of paper . . . Between them and all honest men there is a great gulf fixed' (pp. 265-68).

This sermon was preached on 15th June, 1919. H.D.A.M.

HEALTH AND WEALTH[1]

As the wide vogue of 'Christian Science' cannot be attributed either to the originality or to the soundness of its theology, we may conclude that its results in practice must have been satisfying to a considerable number of people. In fact, Mr. Anson tells us (p. 127) it is impossible to doubt that a very large number, many of whom have suffered greatly at the hands of ordinary medical treatment, have been restored to health through this ministry. 'It is, I suppose, by far the largest movement of psychotherapy to-day.'

And even apart from 'Christian Science,' there seems to be a widening conviction that religion, even if it cannot do everything for us in the way of restoring our physical health that we should like it to do, should at any rate contribute to evenness of temper and general peace of mind—which, indeed, would not be without results on general health as well. Movements like that of the 'New Thought' school emphasize this aspect of religious practice; and the interest shown in 'auto-suggestion' indicates that the British public is convinced that popular religion is not doing nearly all that it could do for the mental peace and happiness of the community.

Anglo-Catholicism, which rarely turns a blind eye on the more conspicuous signs of the times, has taken note of this trend of opinion, and

[1] *Spiritual Healing.* By the Rev. HAROLD ANSON, M.A. (University of London Press, 1923; 3/6 net.)

the sacrament of unction is being hastily revived, and even M. Coué, perhaps to his quiet amusement, has been exploited to some extent. Yet it would hardly seem likely that the Christian Scientists will easily be beaten at their own game.

Liberal Churchmen have been inclined hitherto to adopt a somewhat critical attitude towards a movement which seems to open possibilities of a revival of superstition; yet it is now being recognized among them that the whole question needs careful exploration, and it is perhaps significant that the best Anglican authority on this psycho-physical side of religion (as it may be called) is one of this school.

Now, if Mr. Anson's book constitutes any sort of evidence, it seems not unlikely that the Liberals may be able to do what Anglo-Catholicism is more likely to fail in; even though, at the outset, they did not lose their heads out of enthusiasm.

This prophecy is not inspired merely by partizan animus; and, as proof of this, we would add that in our opinion the Evangelicals, if they take a hand in this business, will do even more badly than the Anglo-Catholics. For what is wrong with both traditionalist parties is their theology—their conception of God.

It is certainly true as we remarked above that the success of 'Christian Science' is in no sense due to its theology, which is at once unoriginal and shaky; but Christian Science theology has the negative virtue of not being wedded to an idea of God developed under the auspices of Semitic frenzy, whether in the days of Joshua and Jael in Palestine, or of Tertullian and Augustine in Phoenician North Africa. It is this *damnosa hereditas* which handicaps Traditionalists; for it is part of their system to teach it to children who, if healthy, repudiate it along with their religion at years of discretion; or, if morbid, suffer in consequence from various 'complexes' for the rest of their lives, with discouraging results for their nervous systems. *Mens sana in corpore sano* cannot be extracted from the relics of Semitic barbarism.

Traditionalism, whether Catholic or Protestant, is too closely associated with that point of view through which the legal phrase, 'An act of God,' has come to have the meaning which a high legal authority gives to it, *i.e.* 'Any calamity for which no rational cause can be assigned.' Furthermore, the more reactionary sections of theological opinion are far too ready to honour the Deity by expanding the gulf believed to exist between man and his Maker. It cannot help people to be told that, save in one unique case, humanity and Deity are mutually exclusive qualities.

We feel convinced ourselves that what we need is a reformulation of Christian belief about Man and God in quite simple and intelligible, and preferably Scriptural, language; though some of our leaders seem too terrified to venture on any attempts in that direction.

Mr. Anson is not afraid, however; and the good quality of his work may be sampled in passages like the following:

> 'We believe that there is in mankind the innate capacity to manifest God, and in every individual man, woman, and child, this Divine Being can be discovered. And it is this Divine quality which constitutes them human beings . . .
>
> 'There is this Divine Being in everyone, waiting to be liberated and expressed, and the Divine can and will express itself in natural, homely, human virtues, and can best express itself so.
>
> 'And, if we are Christians, we don't only believe that this *could* be true, or that it *tends* to be true, or that it is true more or less, or here and there, but it *has* been demonstrated as true in a life actually

lived, which showed once and for all that the divine is most divine when it is also most human' (pp. 53 *f*).

Then again, Mr. Anson makes clear what our 'date and fact' theologians do their best to obscure, *i.e.* that the Incarnation is not only a piece of past history:

> 'The Incarnation, that is to say, the projection of God's character and purpose into time and space, the manifestation of the infinite in the finite, was not begun at Bethlehem or ended at the Ascension. It is a process which began before the world began, and is still in process of completion. The development of God in us is part of the Incarnation—'He is the first-born among many brethren' . . . The Christ is eternal love focussed in the life of Jesus, but manifested also in all those who have the outlook and faith of Jesus both before and after His coming . . .
>
> 'It seems incredible that Christians generally should not have grasped that Jesus did not only claim to be the greatest among the sons of men, but that He is also the Revealer and Manifester of a true humanity of which all partake' (pp. 66 *f*).

On the actual subject of faith healing, Mr. Anson will not seem too encouraging to uncritical believers. He makes it quite clear (1) that mere physical health is to him secondary and that redemption of character is what he is 'out for,' and (2) that the actual results of faith-healing are much less than is sometimes supposed. For example, if people are brought together in a large building with the expectation that a healer is going to work miracles and with the belief that he has quite recently worked them, possibly as many as five per cent. of the sick people will be cured. As, usually, no account is given of the numbers of those who were not cured, there is a general impression that almost everyone present who was ill was cured.

> 'The more I myself have seen of this work of healing, the more sure I am that, while there is a very real basis of fact in many of these cases, it is also always necessary to discount a great deal which arises from quite honest but uncritical enthusiasm' (p. 181).

While we are on this subject, we must express our regret that Mr. Anson has not set his heel more firmly on the neck of that ambiguity which keeps starting up to stultify all discussion: he even *condones* it! 'Miracles, that is, supranormal events, for which at present we are unable to assign any cause,' he writes (*calamo exitiabili*) on p. 184. But St. Thomas Aquinas would have spewed out this definition as inaccurate, indefinite, ambiguous, and, above all, unorthodox. For that great and consistent thinker a miracle is *something that takes place through agencies lying outside the whole of created nature.* A miracle need not even be wonderful, it may be the most ordinary-looking event in the world. On the other hand, a most extraordinary event may not be a miracle. The essence of miracle lies not in its being wonderful, but in its *having its cause outside Nature.*

Nor is our reverence for the Thomist definition mere pedantry. We maintain that his definition makes for clear thinking. The question is do we, or do we not, believe in 'miracle' in *his* sense? Mr. Anson quite evidently does not: he may believe in telepathy, precognitions, healings, prophecies, visions, levitations, but these are not miracles, they are supranormal events—two entirely different classes of phenomena. These wonders may (if St. Thomas is as right in his belief as he is in his definition) be miracles. But they will be so *not because they are supranormal, but*

ecause they are caused by interposition from outside Nature. We are orry to labour a perfectly obvious point, but the incubus of super-aturalism will never loose its hold on religion so long as it can slip back gain disguised as a belief in the supranormal—a belief which nowadays ve all hold.

Having said so much, we hasten to add that Mr. Anson has written n intelligible, straightforward book whch will help a number of readers hom religious and theological literature does not usually attract. If only very clergyman could deliver it all in the form of sermons to his flock! here is at any rate one who will do so, and who is consequently grateful o Mr. Anson. J.C.H.

JESUS AND THE EUCHARIST.*

It is long since we have read a book with such eager pleasure as that fforded by a study of Canon Guy's volume. In fairness of temper, in ucidity of style, in clearness of arrangement and in convincing adequacy f knowledge it may stand as an admirable example of the qualities which work purporting to deal with so important a question as the origin of ne Eucharist ought to possess. As a parish priest of long experience nd as a thoughtful student familiar with New Testament problems and ne literature, both British and foreign, called forth by their attempted olution, Canon Guy is doubly equipped for his task. And his book is n effective refutation alike of the oft-repeated assertion that the demands f parish work leave no time for serious theological study, and of the lea that it is unsafe for the parish priest to deal frankly and squarely ith critical problems.

The book is written for the general reader, and while directly con-erned only with a single question, it affords a most illuminating example f the methods adopted by scholars in the elucidation of New Testament ifficulties in general. Alternative views are set out with commendable earness and impartiality, so that the reader is able to gain an adequate rasp not only of the problem directly treated but of the important col-teral problems, some acquaintance with which is essential to any intelli-ent formulation of opinion on the matter immediately in debate. It is ot too much to say that while no difficulty of which scholars are aware ever burked, yet the presentation of a problem is always of such a ind as to make disputed points readily intelligible to those without tech-ical knowledge of dates and sources.

The title of the book takes the form of a question which few in Eng-nd have set themselves to answer in detail, because the majority are naware of the possibility of any but an affirmative reply. Yet for udents of the New Testament it is a commonplace that of the four ccounts which we possess of the institution of the Lord's Supper, only vo (those of Luke and Paul) represent Jesus as explicitly requiring the ontinuance of the rite; and further, that according to what is almost ertainly the true text of the third Gospel, nothing is said even there of epetition, so that in reality Paul is the sole direct witness for the com-and: 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

At once then we are brought into the region of probabilities. We re concerned with alternative traditions of the words of Jesus, and we re bound to consider the background of the New Testament narratives, sking such questions as the following: What bearing has the expecta-on, ascribed in many quarters to Jesus Himself, of a speedy termination

* *Was Holy Communion instituted by Jesus?* By Douglas S. Guy, B.D. (S.C.M., 24; pp. 213; 6/-.)

of the present order of things on the question whether or not He intended to institute a permanent rite? How far, again, does His general attitude to the institutions of His own time suggest or discourage the idea that He would ordain the repetition of particular acts? What is the significance of the omission from the Fourth Gospel of the institution of the Eucharist? Ought we to think of the Last Supper as a Passover meal in the strict sense, or was it eaten on the day previous to the Passover? What is the meaning of St. Paul's assertion that his knowledge of the institution was 'received from the Lord'? To what extent are we justified in regarding the Apostle as a true interpreter of the mind of Jesus? And in particular should we think of the words: 'Do this in remembrance of me,' as direct historical reminiscence, or rather as a piece of legitimate interpretation? Further, does the theory that Paul's sacramental doctrine shows marked affinities with the mystery religions known to have been fashionable in the world of his day afford the best explanation of all the facts? And finally, do the references to the breaking of the bread in *Acts* lend support to the view that Jesus was understood from the first to have instituted a sacrament intended for repetition?

With all these questions Canon Guy deals fully and fairly. He is of opinion that the eschatological teaching of Jesus was not of such a character as to preclude the possibility of His having established a permanent rite, and he believes further that to acknowledge the evils of institutionalism, as Jesus assuredly did, is by no means tantamount to a proof that He cannot have instituted the Lord's Supper. He is confident that the silence of the fourth Evangelist, whose purpose was avowedly one of selection, is easily explicable, and he accepts the Johannine chronology as against that of the Synoptists, interpreting the words of Jesus: 'With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer,' as the expression of a wish already known to have been frustrated. He argues strongly that Paul makes no claim to have received a direct revelation in the matter of the Eucharist, keeping an open mind on the question whether the words of institution should be ascribed directly to the historical Jesus. He regards Paul as the interpreter *par excellence* of the mind of Christ, and while recognizing the influence of contemporary ideas upon the Apostle's vocabulary, he looks rather to Judaism than to the mystery religions for the main conceptions of the Pauline theology. From the references in *Acts* to the breaking of the bread he draws evidence that the community were conscious of a connection between their practice and the intention of Jesus at the Last Supper.

Despite the scrupulous fairness and studied moderation of Canon Guy's presentation of the evidence, it may perhaps be doubted whether he is always entirely consistent. For example, in dealing with the objection that the whole temper of Jesus was antipathetic to institutionalism, he writes on page 50, quoting, as it happens, some words of my own, 'It is often said that if Jesus commanded Baptism as an outward act, if He instituted Holy Communion as a formal service to be repeated simply because He willed it, if He made participation in these rites a condition of discipleship, then He is inconsistent with the Gospel portrait as a whole,' to which the comment is added, 'There is much exaggeration in such language which we could challenge.' Yet in his final summing up on page 210 he can assert: 'The common view of the institution which attributes to Jesus the intention of creating an external rite or ceremony —something to be done ceremonially—and laying upon His disciples the perpetual obligation of continuing it, that thereby His memory might be preserved and handed down to after generations, seems to me meagre and

nsatisfying. At the best it embodies a very small portion of the truth, nd if we make it the most prominent feature, it is not easy to reconcile ith what we know of Jesus.'

Personally I should accept this statement as both admirable in itself, nd as affording substantial confirmation of my own words. While Canon uy believes for his own part that it was the intention of Jesus to institute permanent rite, he is yet careful to admit that no decisive answer is ally possible. In any case he sees in the historical Last Supper merely starting point for future development, describing the rite as one 'cap- ble of infinite expansion,' rightly stressing the importance of the witness forded by the unbroken observance of the Holy Communion, and declar- g frankly that 'what Jesus did not say on earth He may have said om heaven in and through His listening disciples.' In point of fact, ien, the argument really centres less on the reliability of the historical ata than on the testimony of Christian experience to the value of the act f communion. The rite, as the late C. W. Emmet put it, 'is instinct ith the personality of Christ,' and as such cannot wisely be neglected y those who follow Him. That in effect is the conclusion to which Canon uy's study of the evidence leads him, a conclusion supported by his own xperience as a parish priest. If the result appears to lack definiteness, iat is because Canon Guy is too good a scholar to allow the popular raving for dogmatic statements to over-ride the tentative answers to his uestion which an unflinching loyalty to truth requires.

W. M. Pryke.

ART AND THE PLAIN MAN.*

The volume which bears the somewhat challenging title, *The Necessity f Art*, is yet another instance of the group method which of late years has ecome increasingly common. The six authors have talked over in ommon their individual essays, and these while differing widely in style, ubject matter, and we must needs add in merit, are dominated by one ngle idea—the necessity of art for all, and the responsibility of proclaim- ng this gospel in the ears of the unconverted majority.

Both history and the inner record of spiritual experience testify to the uth which the book is written to enunciate. Professor Dearmer's rresting survey of the development of art from the days of the Catacombs the present time proves the falsity of the common belief that Christianity nd art stand in essential antagonism. It is true that inasmuch as art is projection of human mentality its witness to the absolute values has aried from age to age in clearness and consistency, obscured now by a norbid strain of asceticism, now by a vulgar ostentation and the heresy iat art is essentially an extra, a pleasure necessarily confined to the few, a sort of luxurious fringe of life.' Yet knowledge of architectural evelopment as well as practical observation of the behaviour of dwellers n mean streets, who act in the spirit of the injunction: 'If you have two oaves, sell one and buy a lily,' make abundantly evident the need for a ernacular art as the expression of the highest spiritual realities.

Mr. Malcolm Spencer, who is himself familiar with the Puritan tradition rom the inside, offers a penetrating analysis of the strength and weakness f Puritanism in its condemnation of art. That condemnation was born f fear—fear lest art should mispresent truth, fear lest, usurping its ightful function of interpretation, it should claim to be regarded as a ubstitute for life. Yet no movement can live independently of art, since he impulse to share with others involves expression, and expression is

* *The Necessity of Art.* By A. Clutton Brock and others. (S.C.M., 1924; 7/6.)

itself impossible apart from the employment of external media. In point of fact the Puritan is remarkable not so much for his renunciation of art as such, as for a rigid determination to confine its use to the single medium of the spoken word. But speech is in reality no less open to abuse than music or painting. All alike may prove on the one hand instruments of deception and error, or on the other fitting means for the expression of goodness, truth and beauty.

To Mr. Duncan Jones we owe the thesis that ritual, rightly understood, is a form of response to God, a kind of human applause in face of the divine perfection. We are assured that the tendency of religious men to suppose that conduct is the one legitimate form of obedience to the will of God, and to imagine God as interested solely in ethics, has resulted at times in a conception of the divine character not far removed from parody. Worship involves action. Drama, the sacred dance, ritual of all kinds, Christian or Pagan—these are so many proofs that man wants to *do* something when vividly conscious of the divine presence. Ceremonial in fact may be thought of as 'an expression in action of an attitude towards ultimate reality.'

The difficult and attractive theme of the Artist and the Saint is presented to us in a short paper by Mr. A. W. Pollard. Mr. Pollard writes convincingly of the need to see and to help others to see, maintaining that 'the professions of helping the world to see goodness, of helping it to see beauty, of helping it to see truth have much in common, and that the professors would all do their work more efficiently if they were more in sympathy with each other.'

Perhaps the two outstanding essays are those of Mr. Clutton Brock and Mr. Middleton Murry. Of the loss alike to religion and to art resulting from the death of Clutton Brock no member of the Churchmen's Union will need to be reminded, and the essay which he contributes to the present volume shows him at his best. It is a searching study of our age, its weaknesses and aspirations. Everywhere—in the tendency towards violent methods, in the inane quality of modern amusements, in the glorification of the herd instincts, we may find proofs of spiritual distress, clear manifestations of evils to be remedied, tokens no less evident of the thwarted spiritual expression from which we are suffering, indications of the necessity of art as a means to differentiation, a sure road to the achievement of reality, a way of escape from the banality, sameness, dullness which mark the life and activities of a disappointed and war-weary world.

Mr. Murry, the fortunate possessor of a brilliant style, argues that in the great masterpieces of literature we have the supreme manifestation of religious faith, a record of the struggle of the human soul for freedom, the portrayal of man's endeavour to discover God. Religion, he urges, cannot rightly be confined to one medium of expression. At some periods the Church has stood as a witness to religious truth, at others she has blocked the path to progress, and in so doing has excluded from her borders the pioneers of reality. Until Shakespeare religion and literature had stood together. At the Renaissance man freed himself for ever from the trammels of external authority, and Shakespeare is the first and mightiest witness to his new-found freedom. The task of religion at all times is the task of re-discovery. God and the soul stand sure. Man is free, yet the subject of an inner compulsion. While the teachings of Christ are for ever paramount, it is the duty of the individual to rediscover and personally to appropriate those teachings as the indispensable condition of a true life.

W. M. Pryke.

REALITY AND RELIGION.*

To review the work of a saint is a difficult task. Convicted of inferiority, we wonder if we should share the same opinions could we but live the same life of devotion. Goodness, we feel, should guarantee Truth, and therefore we hesitate to differ from him. Again, we are disarmed from criticism when he declares that he is 'neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but a humble servant of the Lord' (p. v); that he is unable to express all his 'deep feelings and thoughts' (p. vi); while Canon Streeter in his *Introduction* requests us not to cavil at sentences to which a philosopher or scientist might take exception, but 'rather to appreciate the direct simplicity of religious insight which pervades the whole.'

This latter no one can help doing. The book is full of clear, apt, and beautiful expositions or illustrations, which proclaim the Sadhu to be a born teacher and furnish much useful material for those who have to give religious instruction.

The Sadhu has a great fund of common-sense, which, combined with subtlety of insight, saves him from making many serious errors; nevertheless, traces are to be found of the common weaknesses of mystics—fantastical imaginings, over-credulity, lack of critical perception, and the antithesis between heart and head. We take the last and most serious only, selecting two examples: 'The heart has a conception of Reality which is independent of the intellect and whose aptness cannot be understood by the intellect' (p. 53). And again: 'No one can grasp Reality by the intellect' (p. 33). This kind of thing will not do, and those who believe it have no justification for writing books. Man is tri-une and not tri-partite, and neither feelings nor will are independent of the intellect. We do not complain that the Sadhu is unable to set before us ultimate truth about Reality except in inadequate symbols, but we do complain that he should depreciate the God-given faculty whereby alone the completely real may be known by man. We would remind the Sadhu that the classical books of devotion, *e.g. Theologia Germanica,* bear marks that their authors were men and women of highly-developed intellectual capacity who had been well-grounded in philosophy and theology. There is no reason of course why the Sadhu should follow any stereotyped path. He himself is clearly possessed of a vigorous, if not well trained, intellect: his theology is so complete as to be almost called 'dogmatic'; it is based on first-hand experience; and it is also in the best sense 'Modernist.' We read, for example: 'By prayer we cannot change God's plans' (p. 7): 'Miracles are not against the laws of nature' (p. 10): 'If God were as wrathful (*i.e. as man*), the world would have been a heap of ruins long ago' (p. 27).

Above all things, however, having seen, and heard much of, the Sadhu, we look to him as one who has penetrated the mysteries of God; and the present book, admirable as it is, does not satisfy our hunger. The *Life* by Canon Streeter and Dr. Appasamy did more for us. *Reality and Religion* gives us many beautiful thoughts, but after all it is the *lives* of saints that stir our depths and help to break our hearts with longing for holiness. We await eagerly the 'other ideas and experiences' at which the Sadhu hints, but if they are too intimate to be given at present, we trust that he will not fail to see that some record of them is kept for publication after his death.

R. D. RICHARDSON.

* *Reality and Religion. Meditations on God, Man, and Nature.* By SADHU SUNDAR SINGH, with an Introduction by Canon STREETER. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.; 2/6.)

LIVING ISSUES IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.*

This collection of papers is one of the recent publications of the Selly Oak College Central Council, a body of marked individuality and modern sympathies. This volume in particular represents the effort of a trained mind to grapple with the meaning and value of the problems of to-day. What is necessarily lost through a lack of unity, which must be felt in a congeries of essays put together between 1914 and 1923, is gained by the careful examination of tendencies of thought and thinkers, who will have to be reckoned with before there can be any lasting synthesis, without which a Revival of Religion must be indefinitely postponed. Indeed the writer claims that 'the next Revival of Religion' was the *motif* of these essays. This underlies his criticisms of modern theological schismatics like Mr. H. G. Wells and Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, of Liberal Protestantism and Modernist criticism, and of alternative positions bidding with traditional Christianity for popular favour to-day.

Turning then to the central essay of the book, the 'Next Revival of Religion,' it is patent that the writer has looked steadily at post-war facts. Western civilization can scarcely be said to be convalescent yet after its prostration by the war. Panaceas there are in plenty, material, social, and religious. Marxian communism creates a desert, and would call it peace. It has a superficial knowledge of human psychology, but has yet to learn that man does not live by bread alone. Ecclesiastical re-union is a cause that so far has found no martyrs. Many of its most ardent exponents have still to learn that man does not live by phrases alone. The modern world is in such a condition that even the most discounted theories can command a hearing and some measure of assent. Hence 'in many quarters there is a return to the religions of authority. Fundamentalism is the attempt to revive religion by galvanising into life the old dogma of the inerrant and infallible Bible . . . the revival of millenarian hopes . . . a renewed interest in spiritualism' (pp. 133-4). Salvation is not to be found along any of these obsolete lines. Tenacity and enthusiasm do not make untrue the aphorism that 'Time makes ancient good uncouth.' We need a Modern Reformation, an Evangelical Revival of living men and women. These excellent gifts must be won and not borrowed. We must be honest with our forefathers and with ourselves. If we study the past with care and reverence, we shall learn how 'modern' the Reformers and Schoolmen were in the light of the times that we tend either to idealize or depreciate. Mr. Wood says that there are three characteristics of past religious revivals which may be expected to mark all such movements.

(1) The Reformation, the Wesleyan Revival, and the Oxford Movement are inexplicable apart from the tendencies of thought of those periods. Luther, Wesley, Newman were men of the day, *i.e.* Modernists. Man may not put asunder religion and thought without flouting the God who is most honoured when He is worshipped with the mind as well as the heart. Modernism with its insistence upon intellectual sincerity cannot be left out of any future revival of religion. Mr. Wood then appears to be right when he says of the needed revival that 'Any religious movement which ignores or defies the thought of the modern world will not prove to be the revival we need . . . If Christianity is to revive, it must give meaning to the long, costly process by which men have been led or pushed on to their present stage of development' (pp. 136-7).

(2) Past revivals of any account have 'achieved great social and political results,' *e.g.* Calvinism and the Oxford Movement. That is the nature of real Christianity. It finds its level and brims the cup of life.

* *Living Issues in Religious Thought*: From George Fox to Bertrand Russell. By H. G. Wood. (George Allen & Unwin; pp. 187; 6/-.)

(3) Great reformers, like the most spirited members of a family, have all eft home to seek what 'is hidden behind the ranges.' Mechanical repeti-ion of any entrenched orthodoxy is therefore vain. The world grows and inds the bed of current orthodoxy too short for it, and its theological blankets too narrow for its comfort and peace. The wind of new know-edge has the edge of the East on it, and the climate of the Copernican iniverse calls for suitable protection.

Theoretically the layman is still held to be a theologian. He is regarded as responsible for the theology of his clergyman, which is not the same hing as the perversion of this desirable function, *viz.* the not unknown despotism of 'tuning the pulpit.' For a calendar month parishioners have he opportunity of testing the theology of incumbents designate. Perhaps a calendar month is too short. To such we would commend these excellent ests of Mr. Wood, who probably had little thought of any such use of hem. Is a clergyman a Modernist, *i.e. en rapport*, with the best thought of to-day? Is he Catholic, *i.e.* a steward of the mighty sacrament of real ife? Is he Evangelical, *i.e.* a witness to Him from Whom our religion has its name? The central essay of this interesting book has been ex-amined in some detail, because it affords a convenient indication of the healthy realism of this writer, who may be commended to the attention of a thoughtful layman puzzled by the contrary clatter of contending pro-phets. The moral of the book seems to be summed up in the cry, 'How ong, O Lord?' and the reply, 'When you have learnt your lessons, you shall understand.'

Space will not permit more than cursory comment upon some of the other interesting essays in this book, notably the second on 'Logic and Pessimism,' where the work of the Hon. Bertrand Russell is subjected to a searching analysis. It is shown that there is more to be said for his ogic than for his pessimism, which is due at least as much to his being a victim of astronomical intimidation' as to his 'ideal of a scientific philosophy.' Mr. Wood thinks there is much evidence of the fact that uch non-theistic attitudes are bred of a mood peculiar to the age of ransition in which it is our lot to live. The prevalent moral scepticism, in part a reaction from the moral confidence of the Victorians,' as typic-lly expounded by Mr. Russell, is faithfully handled in the third essay. Those who give ready lip-service to the fallacy of the lines often quoted by the ethically inert, 'Set me somewhere east of Suez, where the best s like the worst,' are not allowed to escape the consequences of this posi-ion by Mr. Wood. The controversy, if it can be called such, between Modernists and Liberal Protestants, forms the subject of the fifth essay. The views of Dr. Kirsopp Lake are here examined at some length. It hould therefore be of interest to those members of the Churchmen's Union who still halt between two positions. Two essays are devoted to he significance, theological and religious, of the works of H. G. Wells nd G. Bernard Shaw. Even if they have no final contribution to make, hey are yet important as signs of non-churchly, perhaps non-Christian in narrow sense, hunger for what the world cannot give. The long essay n the Quakers will be read by those who would learn more of an aspect f Christianity, of which the tercentenary of Fox reminds us.

Modern Churchmen are sometimes discouraged if they are tempted to uccumb to the worldliness of counting heads or of over-rating noisy pro-aganda. Books like this one will be welcomed by them the more, because he knowledge of the proximity of unknown workers with similar aims s the best incentive to labour while it is yet day.

A.T.W.D.

A NEW BOOK ON THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.*

There are in existence so many books on the development of Israel's religion that it may well be asked on what grounds an addition to their number is justified. We should like to recommend Dr. Pace's book on this subject not as contributing anything new or original, but as being an admirable summary of what has already been said by others 'in divers portions and in sundry manners.' It will be useful as a text-book for first year theological students as well as for 'those interested in the historical development of religious ideas' for whom the author is also catering. In two ways only does this book differ from the general run of works on this subject. The book is limited to the Ideas of God and development is traced backwards instead of forwards. It is well arranged, and the summaries at the end of each chapter as well as the scheme of headings at the beginning make it useful for study-purposes and for reference. A great merit of the book is its title, *The Ideas of God in Israel,* and the whole treatment of the thesis makes clear the often neglected fact that at no period in Israel's history was one idea of God exclusively held, though the Legalistic conception undoubtedly obtained increasing preponderance. Dr. Pace stresses one aspect of his subject which we do not remember having noticed before. He argues that as traces of primitive animism and saint-worship exist in modern Palestine side by side with theoretical monotheism as they did in early historical times, we may suppose that they were also in existence in parts of the country at the time of Our Lord. Such survivals are indeed possible, though the complete silence of the New Testament does not justify us in regarding them as of much importance. Still the point is an interesting one, and certainly deserves more attention.

There are two notable omissions. In the last chapter in the space of two pages Dr. Pace *mentions* the problem of Evolution and Revelation. It is clear that the writer is not a philosopher. The problem is not nearly so simple as he would leave us to suppose. In chapter VIII, he says: 'We may regard it (*i.e.* the development of Israel's religion) as the evolution of the idea of God in the minds of the best of Israel's sons, or as the self-revelation of God in proportion as his people were prepared to receive the knowledge of him in fuller measure. These are but two ways of regarding the same fact.' That is true: but all our traditional religion from Moses to the Book of Common Prayer has been expressed in terms of Revelation not Evolution. A whole philosophy is involved, but we should never gather that from Dr. Pace's treatment of the subject.

Again, not only in the index, do we miss the blessed word 'Alexandria.'

* *The Ideas of God in Israel.* By EDWARD PACE, M.A., D.D. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; 10/6 net).

O. F. C.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN THE EPISTLES OF ST. JEROME.**

'*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*' might serve as a motto for the useful handbooks issued by the S.P.C.K. familiar to an increasing number of readers, clerical and lay. This book will be welcomed by those who would know more intimately the mind of one of the most remarkable Christians of one of the most formative periods in the history of our religion. It is needless to remind students of the value of a proper estimate of the period that is adorned with the names of SS. Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary in the West, and Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, and the great Cappadocians in the East, with the 'golden age' of the School of Antioch advancing towards its meridian. A glance at the index shows

** *The Christian Church in the Epistles of St. Jerome.* By the Rev. L. HUGHES, D.D. (Pub. S.P.C.K.; pp. 117.)

how much is compressed within a severely restricted number of pages. The quotations from the illuminating letters of St. Jerome are nearly a hundred in all. Only two letters are not quoted of those which Dr. Swete selected as the best. It is from such a letter-writer as St. Jerome that much can be gleaned for our warning. He won his canonization as a great Christian scholar rather than for the qualities personified in most of the saints that enrich the Calendar of Christendom. The Vulgate was his labour of love and the *raison d'être* of his eminence. But there was another Jerome, a very human Jerome, even in his inhumanities. Truth is best perceived as refracted through the prisms of the personalities of really typical figures.

In the first chapter is reviewed St. Jerome's pungent polemic against unworthy clergy of his time—their worldliness, avarice and vanity, to omit grosser lapses, is one of the well-marked reefs upon which indiscriminating idealizing of the classic ages of the Church runs aground. The clerical fop, the gossipful cleric, the 'Blind Mouths' of the day were pilloried as mercilessly in the fourth century by St. Jerome as by Milton in the seventeenth.

Another side of St. Jerome is examined in chapter III, where Dr. Hughes deals with the 'Ascetic and Monastic Movement,' originally a layman's movement, which had immense influence upon European life in after centuries. St. Jerome was closely identified with Christian asceticism, which owing to his persistent advocacy 'became so deeply rooted in Western Christendom.' To the Roman ladies 'he commended celibacy as the only perfect life. It was the hundredfold of the good seed of the Gospel, while widowhood was the sixtyfold, and wedlock the thirtyfold' (cxxiii, 9, and xx, 15). 'Practically, the only useful purpose served by marriage was that it produced virgins, as thorns produce a rose . . . mothers who devoted their daughters to the celibate life became "mothers-in-law of God"' (xxii). It seems incredible that so great a Christian doctor with a unique knowledge of the Bible and that other Bible—Life—could so lack a saving sense of proportion as to teach 'that eating and drinking, marriage and even personal ablutions were low physical indulgences to be disparaged . . . when they could not altogether be discarded. Virginity was the ideal, if not the essential Christian life.' Dr. Hughes quotes (p. 48) a sentence from Dr. Fremantle with reference to these epidemics of pessimism which usually end in libertinism or asceticism—'certain states of the human mind seem all-pervasive like the causes of diseases which spring up at once in many different places.' Dr. Hughes is right in his judgment. 'Asceticism . . . was in the air' and world-wide like the influenza in 1919. St. Jerome succumbed to it and was a typically severe case. Here is another essential line for careful exploration before the adequate reconstruction of Post-Nicene religious life can be hopefully attempted. Whenever man ceases to hope, he ceases to be natural. Francis Thompson's *Health and Holiness* is one of the best modern antidotes to recurrent epidemics of asceticism. This serious departure from the dynamic evangel of Christ has to be taken into account when the question of the authority of the theological formularies of such a period demands a settlement.

In chapter IV Dr. Hughes gives a clear account of Jerome's attitude towards the Roman See and its Pontiff. Evangelicals should note what exactly is implied in any acceptance of the first six centuries when religious issues of any importance call for a decision. The mischief is older than is sometimes realized. St. Jerome had 'an almost servile deference' for Papal supremacy. In some of the later letters there are distinct traces of a diluted admiration 'for everything papal.' It would be an interesting speculation to ask how far the 'Splendour that was Rome' assisted papal

ambitions. St. Jerome (cxxvi) writes that he 'forgot his own name' when Rome was captured by Alaric.

Chapter VI is interesting in furnishing a useful reminder to those who forget that plain men and women peopled the past as they do the present. St. Jerome's letters show rival claimants to important sees. The letter of Epiphanius to St. Jerome (li) places the number of known different heresies in existence at no less than eighty. There was also a very large number of sects. Montanism, Origenism and Pelagianism engaged Jerome as a controversalist. It is perhaps a mark of progress that modern 'sons of thunder' no longer refer to 'the muddy feet of heretics' fouling 'the clear waters of the faith . . .' (cxxvii). In particular these letters show how widespread Origenism was and how much it was the question of the time. Incidentally St. Jerome shows himself to some disadvantage in this connection. He exhibits his susceptibility to the *odium theologium* of lesser men. Probably in his heart as a scholar he never lost his early admiration for Origen, that Alexandrine 'monument of industry.' In letter xxxiii he writes: . . . men could not tolerate the incomparable eloquence and knowledge which, when he once opened his lips, made others dumb.' St. Jerome's perpetual trepidation for his reputation for orthodoxy led him to protest often and probably, in the opinion of his contemporaries, too much. 'From my cradle I have been reared on Catholic milk, and no one can be a better Churchman than one who has never been a heretic' (lxxxii). On this topic he finds refuge in the theory of the dual personality. There is a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde in every man. So he rebuts a charge of Origenism thus: 'I have praised the commentator but not the theologian; the man of intellect but not the believer; the philosopher but not the apostle' (lxxxiv).

This review has been written in the hope that those who have not yet read the letters of St. Jerome will find their way to do so. This book is recommended for its lucidity and grasp of those points by which Dr. Fremantle's estimate is justified: 'His writings contain the whole spirit of the Church of the Middle Ages, its Monasticism, its contrast of sacred things with profane, its credulity . . . its value for relics, its subjection to hierarchical authority, its dread of heresy, its passion for pilgrimage.' *Prolegomena to Jerome* (p. xxxiii).

Or, as Dr. Hughes says in conclusion (p. 109): 'Jerome, in fact, shows in their beginnings three institutions on which the Christianity of the Middle Ages took its stand, *viz.* the Vulgate, the Monastery, the Papacy, a triumvirate which reigned and ruled for more than a millenium; he shows, too, a Church which, outwardly victorious over heathenism and heresy, was still sowing the seeds of internal corruption, and needing continually to pray: 'In all time of our wealth, good Lord deliver us.' A.T.W.D.

CORRESPONDENCE

A NEW *PASTOR IN PAROCHIA*.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

One of the pressing needs of the day, which must have been felt by many parish priests, is a manual for the visitation of the sick, which would take the place which has been held for many years by Bishop Walsham How's *Pastor in Parochia*. A large number of clergy who used this book in the earlier years of their ministry find it increasingly difficult to adapt it to their present needs. Its whole tone and teaching on the subject of sickness belongs to the past, and its general theology expresses an outlook which is ours no longer. We need a book of prayers and readings which can be used by men of modern views. Such a book may perhaps exist already, but, if so, I do not know it. Will not someone set himself to supply the need?

A. C. SINCLAIR.

BEELSBY RECTORY, GRIMSBY.